DATE: October 7, 2016

SUBJECT: Adoption of Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance amendments in furtherance of the goals of the Rosslyn Sector Plan, including:

A. GP-334-16-1 Amendments to the General Land Use Plan (GLUP) Map and Booklet [See Attachments 2 and 3];
B. Amendments to the Master Transportation Plan (MTP) Map [See Attachment 5]; and
C. ZOA-2016-10 Amendments to the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance, §7.15. C-O Rosslyn District [See Attachment 7].

C.M. RECOMMENDATION:

1. Adopt the attached Resolution [Attachment 1] to amend the General Land Use Plan (GLUP) Map and Booklet, as shown in Attachments 2 and 3;
2. Adopt the attached Resolution [Attachment 4] to amend the Master Transportation Plan (MTP) Map, as shown in Attachment 5; and
3. Adopt the attached Ordinance [Attachment 6] to amend, reenact and recodify the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance, §7.15. C-O Rosslyn District, as shown in Attachment 7.

ISSUES: The proposed amendments to the General Land Use Plan, Master Transportation Plan, and Zoning Ordinance are in furtherance of the goals of the Rosslyn Sector Plan, which was adopted by the County Board in July 2015. The proposed amendments are consistent with the Rosslyn Sector Plan. Issues to date have focused on the level of flexibility in the Zoning Ordinance with regard to building height and density and the proposed removal of the existing landscaped open space requirement in the C-O Rosslyn zoning district.
SUMMARY: On July 23, 2015, the County Board adopted the Rosslyn Sector Plan (the Plan). The Plan included several short-term action items, including amendments to the General Land Use Plan (GLUP), Master Transportation Plan (MTP) and Zoning Ordinance to support implementation of the Plan vision. At this time, staff recommends adoption of GLUP, MTP and Zoning Ordinance amendments that are consistent with the adopted Rosslyn Sector Plan. The proposed changes include:

- Amendments to the GLUP Map to add Open Space Symbols and revise the description of the Rosslyn Metro Station Area, and to the GLUP Booklet to revise the language pertaining to the “Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District” (“RCRD”) for consistency with the Rosslyn Sector Plan;
- Amendments to the MTP Map (front side of MTP Map) and Bicycle and Trail Network Map (back side of MTP Map) to reflect the street and bicycle recommendations of the Rosslyn Sector Plan; and
- Amendments to the C-O Rosslyn zoning district to revise the provisions for additional building height and density, remove the landscaped open space requirement and retail and streetscape provisions, and make other changes for consistency, and to facilitate the vision of the Rosslyn Sector Plan.

BACKGROUND: On July 23, 2015, the County Board adopted the Rosslyn Sector Plan. The Plan provides a long-term vision for the core of Rosslyn – the Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District – that will guide future public and private investment over the next twenty years or more. The transformative plan includes a vision, policy guidance and recommendations for land use, transportation, parks and open space, and urban design, building height and form. The Plan includes action steps to be completed to help facilitate implementation of the vision, including the GLUP, MTP and Zoning Ordinance amendments, which are the subjects of this report.

County Board Resolution on the Adoption of the 2015 Rosslyn Sector Plan

In addition to the recommendations of the Rosslyn Sector Plan, County Board guidance for implementation was also provided in its resolution on the adoption of the Rosslyn Sector Plan (located after the front cover of the Plan). The resolution reinforces the Plan’s vision and recommendations while also clarifying that the document is guiding, not regulatory. As such, the resolution states that alternative and creative solutions that meet the goals of the Plan should be considered through the review of future site plan proposals. The County Board’s resolution helped to inform formulation of the proposed amendments.
DISCUSSION:

Proposed General Land Use Plan (GLUP) Amendments:

GLUP Map Amendments

1. Amend the GLUP Map to add open space symbols within the “Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District” (“RCRD”) at the locations recommended in the Rosslyn Sector Plan (Map 3.3 on page 83 of the Rosslyn Sector Plan).

Consistent with the goals and recommendations of the Rosslyn Sector Plan, three open space symbols (triangles) are proposed to be added to the GLUP Map. The general locations of these new open spaces are at the southeast corner of the Key Boulevard and North Oak Street intersection (Oak and Key Plaza), at the Metro station entrance between North Moore Street and Fort Myer Drive (Metro Station Plaza), and on the southern frontage of 18th Street North between North Kent Street and Arlington Ridge Road (Rosslyn Plaza Park). The GLUP Map will also be updated to graphically show the street network recommended by the Rosslyn Sector Plan within the “Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District.”

The Rosslyn Sector Plan also recommends that the boundary of the “Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District” be amended to remove the 1555 Wilson Boulevard site. This was previously completed with GLUP amendments adopted by the County Board in February 2016 to implement the Western Rosslyn Area Plan.

2. Amend text on the back side of the GLUP Map for the Rosslyn Metro Station Area.

The back side of the GLUP Map shows larger scale representation of the GLUP designations across each of the three Major Planning Corridors. The GLUP Map also includes a box with information and highlights of the areas within these corridors. The box for Rosslyn is proposed to be updated to add the Rosslyn Sector Plan and the Western Rosslyn Area Plan under the list of “Adopted Plans,” to update the “Station Area Concept” and “Plan Features” to be consistent with the Rosslyn Sector Plan, and to add the “Western Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District” to the list of “Special Planning Areas.”

GLUP Booklet Amendments

1. Amend the text for the “Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District” to be consistent with the Rosslyn Sector Plan.

The description of the “RCRD” on pages 13-14 of the GLUP Booklet is proposed to be revised to reflect the vision, goals, policies, and recommendations included in the Rosslyn Sector Plan. The description of Rosslyn’s role within the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor (pages 12-13) is also proposed to be updated from “a first class office and business center” to “a mixed-use gateway with Arlington’s greatest concentration of jobs, housing and activities.” This description is more consistent with the Rosslyn Sector Plan’s emphasis on increasing residential development within the “RCRD.” In addition to these changes, general references to the County Board’s adoption of the Rosslyn Sector Plan are proposed to be added to the GLUP Booklet.
2. Amend text to remove the “Resolution Governing Building Heights in Rosslyn” and the “Resolution on Urban Design Principles for Rosslyn Central Place” and to add references to these resolutions to the “Historical Documents” section.

Appendix 1 of the GLUP Booklet provides the full text of Special Planning Resolutions and Policies adopted by the County Board. This section includes two resolutions regarding building heights in Rosslyn: “Resolution Governing Building Heights in Rosslyn,” adopted on September 17, 2002; and “Resolution on Urban Design Principles for Rosslyn Central Place,” adopted by the County Board on May 5, 2007. With the adoption of the Rosslyn Sector Plan, the County Board established a new building heights policy for the “RCRD” that incorporates varied building heights across the district. Since the new approach to building heights supersedes the 2002 and 2007 resolutions, staff proposes removing the full text of these resolutions from the GLUP Booklet and adding a reference to the resolutions under the list of “Historical Documents” on page 36. Referencing these resolutions in the historical documents section will appropriately reflect that the Rosslyn Sector Plan is the current policy document for the “RCRD.”

Proposed Master Transportation Plan (MTP) Amendments: The MTP promotes effective travel and accessibility for the County’s residents, workers and visitors; provides a policy framework to guide the development of projects and programs; advances the County’s goals and objectives; and helps direct infrastructure investment. The proposed amendments will ensure consistency between the MTP and the Rosslyn Sector Plan regarding the future transportation infrastructure and conditions envisioned in the “Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District.” The amendments specifically implement the recommendations made regarding Street Classifications and Typologies (Map 3.7 on page 97 of the Rosslyn Sector Plan) and Bike Facilities (Map 3.11 on page 117 of the Rosslyn Sector Plan).

The MTP includes three primary elements: 1) a MTP Goals and Policies document; 2) a map which illustrates key existing transportation facilities and planned system improvements; and 3) additional modal elements that provide detailed information in key areas. To implement the Rosslyn Sector Plan, amendments are proposed to the MTP map.

Concurrent with the proposed MTP amendments related to the Rosslyn Sector Plan, staff is also proposing County-wide amendments to the MTP Streets Element to add a new street typology for Pedestrian Street (the subject of a separate report). Reflective of this intent, the following amendments include designations for new pedestrian street segments in Rosslyn. These correspond with the recommendations of the sector plan regarding street classifications.

1. The proposed amendments to the map on the front of the MTP Map (see Attachment 5) include the following:

   a. Remove the designation of “Area Planned for New Streets” labeled as #12, Rosslyn Redevelopment
   b. Amend the typology of streets as follows:
i. Change 19th Street North between Fort Myer Drive and North Lynn Street from Type B to Type A;
ii. Change Fort Myer Drive between Wilson Boulevard and 19th Street North from Type B to Type A;
iii. Change Wilson Boulevard between Fort Myer Drive and North Lynn Street from Type B to Type A;
iv. Change North Lynn Street between Wilson Boulevard and 19th Street North from Type B to Type A;
v. Change North Nash Street between Key Boulevard and Lee Highway westbound from Type B to Urban Center Local;
vi. Change North Nash Street between Wilson Boulevard and 17th Street North from Type B to Urban Center Local; and
vii. Change 17th Street between North Nash Street and Fort Myer Drive from Type B to Urban Center Local.

c. Add new segments of streets as follows:
   i. New segment of Urban Center Local to be known as North Ode Street, between 18th Street North and Clarendon Boulevard;
   ii. New segment of Urban Center Local to be known as North Nash Street, between 17th Street North and Fairfax Drive;
   iii. New segment of Urban Center Local to be known as 18th Street North, between North Lynn Street and Arlington Ridge Road;
   iv. New segment of Urban Center Local to be known as 17th Street North, between North Kent Street and Arlington Ridge Road;
   v. New Segment of Pedestrian Street to be known as 17th Street North extension (Freedom Park), between Fort Myer Drive and N. Kent Street;
   vi. New segment of Pedestrian Street to be known as North Orme Street, between 18th Street North and Wilson Boulevard;
   vii. New segment of Pedestrian Street to be known as North Orme Street, between Wilson Boulevard and Clarendon Boulevard.
   viii. New Segment of Pedestrian Street to be known as 18th Street North, between North Lynn Street and North Oak Street; and
   ix. New Segment of Pedestrian Street to be known as 20th Street North, between North Nash Street and Fort Myer Drive.

The Rosslyn Sector Plan recommends transforming Rosslyn into a more walkable neighborhood with a refined, pedestrian-scaled block pattern that reduces block lengths and provides greater route choices. Further, the Plan strives to re-balance the right-of-way to shift more space to people from vehicles and to prioritize vehicular access to local destinations rather than through travel. The proposed amendments to the street typologies reflect the character of Rosslyn’s streets as envisioned in the Plan. New street segments further accomplish the Plan’s vision by providing additional access points and breaking up long blocks. As a central recommendation of the Plan, the extension of 18th Street North will serve as a new central spine through the heart of Rosslyn. The new street segments will typically be created across privately owned land as redevelopment occurs.
2. **The proposed amendments to the Bicycle and Trail Network Map** on the back side of the MTP Map (see Attachment 5) include the following:

   a. Change existing bicycle facilities as follows:
      i. North Nash Street between Fort Myer Drive and Wilson Boulevard from on-street route to bike lane;
      ii. Wilson Boulevard from North Nash Street to North Lynn Street from on-street route to bike lane; and
      iii. North Lynn Street from Wilson Boulevard to Fairfax Drive from on-street route to bike lane.

   b. Add new planned segments of bicycle and pedestrian facilities as follows:
      i. Rosslyn Esplanade (off-street trail), between Rosslyn Circle and Iwo Jima;
      ii. Freedom Park Trail (off-street trail), between Fort Myer Drive and 19th Street North;
      iii. Potomac River Connector Trail (off-street trail), between North Arlington Ridge Road and Mt. Vernon Trail (2 alternatives);
      iv. Arlington Boulevard Trail (off-street trail), between North Rhodes Street and Fort Myer Drive;
      v. North Meade Street (bicycle lanes), between Fairfax Drive and Marshall Drive;
      vi. 19th Street North (bicycle lanes), between Fort Myer Drive and North Kent Street;
      vii. Wilson Boulevard (bicycle lanes), between North Nash Street and North Arlington Ridge Road;
      viii. 18th Street North (on-street bicycle route), between North Arlington Ridge Road and North Lynn Street;
      ix. North Moore Street (on-street bicycle route), between 19th Street North and Wilson Boulevard;
      x. North Nash Street (on-street bicycle route), between Lee Highway and Key Boulevard; and
      xi. North Nash Street to 17th Street North (on-street bicycle route), between Clarendon Boulevard and Fort Myer Drive.

The Rosslyn Sector Plan recommends expanding and enhancing the system of bicycle facilities in and around Rosslyn, including better connections to County and regional trail system routes and safer bicycling conditions within Rosslyn. The proposed amendments to the Bicycle and Trail Network Map, which includes a combination of multi-use trail, cycle tracks, bike lanes, sharrows and signed routes, represent a more integrated and connected network that will better support bicycling as a future mode of transportation in Rosslyn. While the MTP’s Bicycle and Trail Network Map does not currently differentiate between conventional bike lanes and protected bikes lanes (i.e. cycle tracks), the Rosslyn Sector Plan identifies recommended locations for each type of bike lanes, as depicted in Map 3.11, Bike Facilities (page 117 of the Rosslyn Sector Plan). The bicycle network improvements will be implemented as feasible, with restriping or adjacent development projects.
Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments: The C-O Rosslyn zoning district was created in 1996 to support the implementation of the 1992 Rosslyn Station Area Plan Addendum. Sites within the “RCRD” are eligible to be rezoned to C-O Rosslyn and utilize the district’s regulations for development. To facilitate the vision of the Rosslyn Sector Plan, the C-O Rosslyn district is proposed to be amended. Specifically, the Plan recommends codifying building height (including provisions for flexibility), density and stepbacks (page 155 of the Rosslyn Sector Plan). The zoning district is further proposed to be comprehensively updated to improve clarity and reflect current County policy where needed, addressing elements such as the purpose, retail uses, landscaping, parking, and streetscapes.

1. Building Height and Stepbacks
Currently, C-O Rosslyn permits building heights up to 300 feet, with provisions to exceed that height at Central Place when certain criteria are met. These provisions support a 2002 County Board-adopted policy for building heights in Rosslyn that calls for locating the tallest buildings at the center of the “RCRD” (at Metro) with building heights tapering down towards the edges of the “RCRD.” In contrast, the 2015 Plan now recommends a peaks and valleys approach to building heights that protects priority view corridors, provides for sensitive transitions, and creates an attractive, distinctive skyline. To achieve this, the Plan recommends varied building heights across the district, stepbacks, and neighborhood transitions, summarized as follows:

- A Building Heights Map (Map 3.16, page 169 of the Rosslyn Sector Plan), which includes the following elements:
  - Recommended maximum building heights above average site elevation;
  - Recommended frontages where a 15’ stepback between the building base and tower at approximately three to six stories should occur (further described on page 176 of the Rosslyn Sector Plan); and
  - Recommended frontages adjacent to lower density neighborhoods where transitions in building height should occur (further described on page 176 of the Rosslyn Sector Plan).

- Building Height Flexibility (page 168 of the Rosslyn Sector Plan):
  - For any single-tower site with a building height limit on the Building Heights Map below 300 feet, development proposals may be submitted that propose to achieve up to 300 feet. The plan includes a list of nine criteria that should be met to consider the additional building height.

- Other guidance:
  - Public Observation Deck priority view corridors, including graphics and descriptions of the key landmarks that should remain visible; and
  - Additional recommendations for buildable areas and edges, ground level design, service and parking access, parking location and design, grade transition, street and neighborhood scale transition, tower orientation, dimensions, spacing and use, and architectural composition of tower and caps.
Considerations in drafting the approach
In drafting the appropriate zoning approach for building height and stepbacks, certain considerations were taken into account to ensure that the C-O Rosslyn district meets the intent of the Plan and the County Board’s resolution to adopt the Plan. The considerations included:

- Upholding the vision, goals, and recommendations of the Plan;
- Providing predictability and clarity for developers and community members; and
- Affording the ability to address project- and/or site-specific conditions and provide creative solutions (e.g., site grade or orientation, location of the line delineating a split-height zone in a single block, accommodation of a creative rooftop or stepback solution, increased differentiation between tower heights in multi-tower site plans, and other unanticipated circumstances).

Staff analyzed and shared with ZOCO, a variety of approaches to addressing building heights and stepbacks in C-O Rosslyn, including incorporation of the Plan’s Building Heights Map into the Zoning Ordinance as mandatory heights for each parcel shown on the map. Each of these approaches were evaluated against the considerations outlined above, taking into account the collective community input received during the public review process. As a result, staff is proposing the following approach to building height and stepbacks.

Proposed approach for building height and stepbacks
The proposed zoning provisions for additional building height include the following elements:

- The County Board, through a special exception site plan approval, may approve building heights, exclusive of mechanical penthouses, up to the building heights and consistent with the neighborhood transitions and step-backs shown on the Building Heights Map (by way of reference to the Plan) based on findings that reinforce the goals of the plan;
- Further, the County Board, through a special exception site plan approval, may approve building heights above those on the Building Heights Map (by way of reference to the Plan) when warranted by site-specific considerations and when the aforementioned findings are still met; and
- The County Board would not have the authority to approve building heights above 470 feet above sea level, inclusive of mechanical penthouses and parapet walls. This is consistent with the absolute maximum height that was considered through the Rosslyn Sector Plan process.
The following chart summarizes the existing and proposed C-O Rosslyn building height regulations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current C-O Rosslyn Building Height Regulations</th>
<th>Proposed C-O Rosslyn Building Height Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By-Right: 35’ max</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Exception – Base Heights:</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office, Retail, Service Commercial: 153’ max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-Family Dwellings and Hotel: 180’ max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Exception – Provisions for additional height:</td>
<td>The County Board, through site plan approval, may approve height up to and above the building heights map in the Plan based on a set of findings (see below) up to a maximum height of 470’ above sea level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The County Board, through site plan approval, may approve up to 300’ (with provisions for additional height within Central Place)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to approve a site plan with heights up to and above those on the Building Heights Map in the Plan, the County Board would need to find the site plan consistent with the peaks and valleys building height policy of the Rosslyn Sector Plan, with attributes including but not limited to:

a) Priority view corridors from the public observation deck are preserved;

b) The development project contributes to a distinctive and dynamic skyline with varied heights and architectural expression;

c) The development project provides a transition in scale and height to surrounding lower density neighborhoods;

d) The design of the development project considers opportunities for daylight for public parks and open spaces envisioned in the Rosslyn Sector Plan; and

e) The development project provides an appealing, pedestrian-scaled street environment.

The proposed amendment references the Building Heights Map in the Plan, but does not include the map in the Zoning Ordinance. Staff proposes that a reference to the map, supplemented by inclusion of required findings, most effectively upholds the policies of the Plan while providing the County Board discretion to consider, and approve when warranted, building heights and stepbacks that reasonably vary from those specified on the Building Heights Map. In this way, the approach proposed above reinforces the Plan’s building height recommendations in a manner consistent with the County Board’s resolution on plan adoption.
2. **Provisions for Additional Density**

C-O Rosslyn currently permits a floor area ratio (FAR) of up to 3.8 for commercial/office uses and up to 4.8 for residential or hotel uses, subject to special exception approval. The district further permits the County Board to approve additional density up to a maximum of 10.0 FAR when the proposal offers important community benefits identified in approved plans for the area and meets the other special exception criteria of the Zoning Ordinance. The Rosslyn Sector Plan recommends maintaining the current maximum of 10.0 FAR, except in the following two instances, which are addressed in the proposed amendments to C-O Rosslyn:

- **Transformational Infrastructure.** The Plan recommends that the County Board should have the ability to consider, in specific instances necessary to accomplish transformational infrastructure elements identified in the plan, additional density above 10.0 FAR (page 154 of the Rosslyn Sector Plan). The Plan further states that the additional density above 10.0 FAR should be consistent with the Plan’s building height and form guidelines.

  The term transformational infrastructure is not defined in the Plan. Through the sector plan process, it was identified that certain sites in Rosslyn that are critical to the achievement of the 18th Street corridor may have difficulty redeveloping without additional density (above 10.0 FAR). The impetus for the recommendation in the Plan emerged from the desire to facilitate redevelopment of these challenged sites, which are already built out at or close to 10.0 FAR yet have additional building height and/or volume available under the design guidelines of the Plan. The term transformational infrastructure was added to the Plan during the County Board hearing for the Rosslyn Sector Plan to better define the parameters by which additional density above 10.0 FAR should be considered. During the public review process for the Zoning Ordinance amendment, comments were received that a second Metro station is a similar transformational infrastructure project that may need particular, challenged sites to redevelop in order to be achieved. The proposed amendment would allow the County Board to approve density above 10.0 FAR for a site plan if it finds that additional density is necessary to physically accomplish, on the subject site, new segments of 18th Street North or infrastructure that would substantially increase future Metrorail capacity. The proposed text would preclude, however, the approval of additional height above that recommended on the Building Heights Map when additional density is sought to be achieved through this provision, consistent with the recommendations of the Plan.

- **Transfer of Development Rights (TDR).** The Plan references the potential future use of TDR in Rosslyn, specifically, in the criteria listed for height flexibility for single tower sites (p. 168 of the Rosslyn Sector Plan). The proposed amendments would allow the TDR policy (located in Appendix 1 of the GLUP Booklet) and the provisions of §15.5.7.B. to apply in the “RCRD.” Development projects that achieve density through a TDR could exceed 10.0 FAR. Such projects would also be eligible to request additional height exceeding that depicted in the Plan’s Building Heights Map under the zoning provisions described earlier in this report, consistent with the guidance set forth in the Rosslyn Sector Plan.
3. **Landscaped Open Space**

Currently, the C-O Rosslyn district provisions require that 20% of a site be landscaped open space. This requirement can be, and has regularly been, modified by site plan. Landscaped open space is not a defined term in the Zoning Ordinance, and in the past this requirement has been met in a variety of ways. Landscaped open space is not required to be public, and it can be provided on a rooftop or internal to the site for private use by the building occupants. Further, because the term is not defined, there is also no zoning requirement for the amount of this required area that needs to be landscaped/green, so any accessible portion of a site that is not covered by a roof and is not otherwise used for parking/driveways can be counted toward this requirement.

The Rosslyn Sector Plan discourages the provision of small on-site open spaces when they detract from the overall public realm urban design vision for Rosslyn. In such cases, the Plan indicates it may be preferable for a redevelopment project to contribute to the enhancement or creation of one of the parks envisioned in the Plan. A landscaped open space requirement in the Zoning Ordinance may inadvertently encourage spaces that detract from achieving a more continuous street edge, while not meaningfully contributing to Rosslyn’s park and open space network. Therefore, staff proposes to remove the landscaped open space requirement. In consideration of the Plan’s recommendations, appropriate provisions of on-site or off-site open space should be evaluated and determined during the site plan review process.

4. **Other Proposed Changes to C-O Rosslyn**

Additional revisions are proposed to reflect the policy guidance of the Rosslyn Sector Plan and to improve the clarity and formatting of the C-O Rosslyn District. These changes include:

- **Purpose:** Updates to this paragraph are proposed to incorporate the goals of the Rosslyn Sector Plan, to remove language that does not relate to the purpose, and to clarify that C-O Rosslyn applies to the “RCRD.”

- **Retail Uses and Streetscape:** These paragraphs are proposed to be removed. The ground floor use and streetscape recommendations in the Plan are intended to guide the development of streetscapes and ground floor retail and other uses, and staff proposes that they do not need to be further articulated in the Zoning Ordinance.

- **Other:** References to policy guidance are proposed to be updated; outdated zoning text is proposed to be removed where no longer needed; and the text is proposed to be reformatted for clarity.

**COMMUNITY PROCESS:** The proposed amendments were discussed at one joint Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) and Zoning Committee (ZOCO) meeting, followed by three additional ZOCO meetings. Members of the Rosslyn Process Panel, including representatives from North Rosslyn Civic Association, Radnor-Fort Myer Heights Civic Association, Rosslyn Business Improvement District, Transportation Commission, and Park and Recreation Commission, were invited to participate in the LRPC and ZOCO meetings. The proposed amendments were also presented at meetings of the Economic Development Commission,
The schedule of outreach for the proposed amendments was as follows:

- February 24, 2016    LRPC/ZOCO
- April 12, 2016       ZOCO
- April 13, 2016       NAIOP/NVBIA
- April 20, 2016       Chamber of Commerce
- May 25, 2016         ZOCO
- June 28, 2016        Park and Recreation Commission
- July 12, 2016        Economic Development Commission
- July 12, 2016        ZOCO

Transportation Commission. On September 29, 2016, the Transportation Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the Master Transportation Plan, with one recommendation to change the proposed name of “Pedestrian Streets” to “Pedestrian Priority Streets.” Staff concurs with the proposed name, and the name change will be reflected on an updated Recommended Master Transportation Plan Amendment map (Attachment 5) in a supplemental report.

Planning Commission. The Planning Commission heard the proposed amendments on October 5, 2016. The Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposed General Land Use Plan, Master Transportation Plan, and Zoning Ordinance amendments, with several changes to the amendments also recommended. The Planning Commission’s recommendations and staff responses will be provided in a supplemental report.

Key issues. Through the public review process outlined above, the following key issues were raised.

Building Height Provisions: Inclusion of the Building Height Map in the Zoning Ordinance, and Level of Flexibility
Much of the discussion throughout the community review process focused on whether the Building Heights Map should be included in the Zoning Ordinance and the level of flexibility the County Board should have in approving heights above those on the Building Heights Map. Several of the participants recommended that the map should be incorporated into the C-O Rosslyn district to prescribe mandatory heights instead of only being referenced in the Zoning Ordinance as the starting point for the County Board’s analysis and ultimate decision on the appropriate height for a particular site plan project. Further, several participants also suggested that the proposed findings should be more objective and provide the County Board with less discretion to approve heights above those recommended by the map. Participants raised concerns about the effectiveness of the findings in upholding the Plan’s vision.

In its resolution to adopt the Plan, the County Board gave clear direction that all future development projects in the “RCRD” should be able to offer creative alternative solutions or
proposals consistent with the stated goals of the Plan, to be considered as part of the site plan review process. Given the County Board’s guidance, and in order to facilitate this type of flexibility in the proposed amendments, staff recommends that the County Board have the authority to approve variations from those heights shown on the Building Heights Map in the Rosslyn Sector Plan. Staff does not recommend including a map in the Zoning Ordinance while also allowing that map to be modified by the County Board as part of a site plan approval. This conflicting approach could lead to a misinterpretation of the role of the Building Heights Map and a lack of clarity in administration of the zoning district regulations. Rather, staff proposes that a reference to the map in conjunction with required findings most effectively reflects and elevates the policy articulated by the Building Heights Map while also allowing for consideration of creative alternative solutions or proposals consistent with the Board’s earlier guidance. The findings are intended to further reinforce the goals of the Plan while still providing the County Board with discretion to approve varied heights. Staff does not recommend making the findings more objective, as this would remove the intended discretion. The policy and recommendations of the adopted Plan, coupled with the proposed findings in the Zoning Ordinance, will provide appropriate guidance to ensure the Plan’s vision is upheld.

Density above 10.0 FAR for Transformational Infrastructure
At ZOCO and through other public outreach, comments were received that the proposed amendment should expand the provision for density above 10.0 FAR so that it could be granted more broadly rather than limiting the provision, as proposed by staff, to the extension of 18th Street North and enhanced long-term capacity of the Rosslyn Metro station. Some commenters suggested that the provision could be used to garner off-site improvements or contributions. Staff considered the additional input. As stated earlier this report, the impetus for the recommendation in the Plan emerged from the desire to facilitate redevelopment of challenged sites which are already built out at or close to 10.0 FAR yet have additional building height and/or volume available under the design guidelines of the Plan. The redevelopment of these sites may be critical to achieving certain new segments of 18th Street North. While the origins of this provision emerged from the challenges facing one site in particular, staff proposes that additional density above 10.0 FAR possibly be considered for any site plan incorporating a new segment of 18th Street North due to the transformational qualities of the corridor.

During the process, staff expanded the provision to also capture the ability to grant density for additional capacity associated with a second future Metro station after consideration of public input that this infrastructure is similar in significance to central Rosslyn as is the extension of 18th Street North. The Plan recommendation for densities above 10.0 FAR was not intended as a mechanism for achieving additional contributions or off-site improvements. The C-O Rosslyn district is structured to achieve significant improvements/contributions (site plan features and amenities) through the earning of density up to 10.0 FAR, and staff does not recommend expanding the ability to modify density as this may have many unintended consequences that work counter to the goals and intentions of the design guidelines set forth in the Plan.

Landscaped Open Space
Several comments were received both at ZOCO and at the Park and Recreation Commission recommending that the landscaped open space requirement be maintained in C-O Rosslyn or,
alternatively, revised to require either on-site public open space or a contribution toward off-site public open space.

As stated earlier in this report, the current 20% landscaped open space requirement is not a defined term in the Zoning Ordinance and is not required to be public or fully landscaped. Staff recommends removing this requirement as the Plan discourages the provision of small on-site open spaces when they detract from achieving Rosslyn’s urban design vision for a more continuous street edge while not meaningfully contributing to Rosslyn’s park and open space network.

Staff does not recommend an on-site public open space requirement for all projects as this is inconsistent with the Plan recommendations regarding the Rosslyn public parks and open space network and vision of Rosslyn’s future public realm. Staff also does not recommend required contributions toward off-site public open space for all projects as this contradicts the Plan’s recommendations regarding prioritization of community benefits. The Plan recommends that community benefit contributions be strategically focused to accomplish elements of the Plan more effectively. Rather than each development project contributing small amounts toward a broad range of community benefits, the Plan promotes the idea that in some, if not all, instances, it is preferable to focus a larger amount of benefits towards a specific project type to realize an individual project sooner. This approach would allow the County Board to make decisions about how to best focus community benefits during the site plan process, based on a site’s location and corresponding on-site or adjacent improvements, County priorities at the time of approval, and timing of infrastructure or park improvements. Requiring an open space contribution in all instances as part of the Zoning Ordinance is not consistent with the Plan guidance and would remove the County Board’s ability to make strategic decisions at the time of site plan approval.

**CONCLUSION:** The proposed General Land Use Plan, Master Transportation Plan and Zoning Ordinance amendments are consistent with the adopted policy guidance in the Rosslyn Sector Plan and will help implement the vision expressed therein. Therefore, staff recommends that the County Board adopt the proposed General Land Use Plan, Master Transportation Plan, and Zoning Ordinance amendments.
RESOLUTION ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE
GENERAL LAND USE PLAN (GLUP) AND GLUP BOOKLET

WHEREAS, the County Board of Arlington County has been presented with proposed amendments of the General Land Use Plan (“GLUP”) Map and Booklet, which are part of the County’s Comprehensive Plan, to:

1. Amend the GLUP Map to add open space symbols (triangles) within the “Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District” (“RCRD”) at the southeast corner of the Key Boulevard and North Oak Street Intersection (Oak and Key Plaza), at the Metro Station Entrance between North Moore Street and Fort Myer Drive (Metro Station Plaza), and on the southern frontage of 18th Street between North Kent Street and Arlington Ridge Road (Rosslyn Plaza Park);

2. Amend text on the back side of the GLUP Map for the Rosslyn Metro Station Area;

3. Amend the text in the GLUP Booklet for the “RCRD” to be consistent with the Rosslyn Sector Plan; and

4. Amend text in the GLUP Booklet to remove the “Resolution Governing Building Heights in Rosslyn” and the “Resolution on Urban Design Principles for Rosslyn Central Place” and to add references to these resolutions to the “Historical Documents” Section; and

WHEREAS, the County Manager has recommended that the proposed amendments be adopted; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission recommends adoption of the proposed GLUP amendments; and

WHEREAS, the County Board of Arlington County has considered the foregoing recommendations and the purposes of the GLUP and the Comprehensive Plan as set forth in these documents, the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance, and the Code of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the County Board of Arlington County held a duly advertised public hearing on the proposed amendments to the GLUP on October 15, 2016.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that, based on the aforementioned considerations, deliberations and all public comments, the County Board of Arlington County hereby adopts the proposed amendments to the GLUP set forth in Attachments 2 and 3.
GP-334-16-1 General Land Use Plan Amendments (Map)

Legend
- Low-Medium Residential
- Medium Residential
- High-Medium Residential
- High Residential
- Public
- Low Office-Apartment-Hotel
- Medium Office-Apartment-Hotel
- High Office-Apartment-Hotel
- Government Owned
- MetroRail Station
- Open Space
- Planning Districts

Notes
2. This area was designated the Western Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District on 2/20/16.
13. These areas were designated as "Special Affordable Housing Protection District": Twin Oaks on 5/24/00; WRIT Rosslyn Center on 7/20/02; Rosslyn Ridge on 7/10/04; and Rosslyn Commons on 6/17/06.
15. This area was designated as the "Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District" on 5/11/96 and revised on 2/20/16.
22. This area was designated the Fort Myer Heights North Special District on 4/16/05.

Map prepared by Arlington County, Va. GIS Mapping Center
August 2016
Map Scale 1" = 400'
General Land Use Plan (GLUP) Amendments (Map and Booklet Text)

GLUP Map Text (back side): Major Planning Corridors

Rosslyn
Rosslyn Adopted Plans: Rosslyn Station Area Plan Addendum, 1992; Rosslyn to Courthouse Urban Design Study, 2003; Fort Myer Heights North Plan, 2008; Rosslyn Sector Plan, 2015; Western Rosslyn Area Plan, 2015.

Station Area Concept: Mixed-use gateway with the Arlington’s greatest concentration of jobs, housing and activities; a preeminent destination with unparalleled views of and connections to Greater Washington; mid and high density residential neighborhoods surrounding the core mixed use district. First class office and major employment center with a core area office and hotel development surrounded by high density residential development.

Plan Features:

- Arlington’s world class downtown
- A global destination with a dynamic skyline, unique vistas, and exceptional value
- Exceptional transportation connections and choices
- A walkable neighborhood connecting people with community and choices
- A good neighbor to adjacent communities
- An urban district that celebrates the experiences of nature and recreation
- A dynamic place inspired by its diverse mix of people and activity
- Urban parks and connections to the Potomac River and nearby monuments (Marine Corps War Memorial, Arlington National Cemetery, Netherlands Carillon)
- The 18th Street Corridor as an urban spine comprising a series of dynamic and memorable public open spaces
- A public Observation Deck at Central Place, offering unique, high priority public views of the Monumental Core and other key vistas
- Preservation of Colonial Terrace, Colonial Village, and Radnor-Fort Myer Heights residential areas

- Gateway to Arlington from Washington, D.C.
- Deck over I-66 for public open space
- Superior architecture and urban design
- Urban parks and museums
- Residential development in support of office uses
- Central Place
- Headquarters of major corporations
- Integrated transportation system
- Expansion of hotel resources
- Physical and visual access to the Potomac River and nearby Parks and Monuments (Iwo Jima, Netherlands Carillon, Arlington National Cemetery, Marine Memorial, etc.)
- High quality retail, restaurant and entertainment facilities
- Greatest building heights to be focused closest to the Metro Station with building heights tapering down to locations farther away from the Metro Station
Special Planning Districts: "Coordinated Preservation and Development District" (Colonial Village); "Special Affordable Housing Protection District" (Twin Oaks, WRLT Rosslyn Center, Rosslyn Ridge, and Rosslyn Commons); "Radnor Heights East Special District;"; "Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District;" - "Western Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District."

Neighborhood Conservation Plan Area: Radnor/Fort Myer Heights (Plan accepted 2007).

GLUP Booklet Text
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2010s
The 2011 General Land Use Plan incorporates land use changes adopted by the County Board between April 27, 2004 and December 10, 2011, including the establishment of the “Crystal City Coordinated Redevelopment District” in 2010 and the “East Falls Church Neighborhood Center District” in 2011. Additional updates to the General Land Use Plan occurred with the County Board adoption of the “Columbia Pike Neighborhoods Special Revitalization District” in 2013, the “Western Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District” in 2016, and refinements to the “Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District” in 2016. The web version is updated on a semiannual basis to incorporate GLUP amendments and administrative corrections and will be brought forth to a formal County Board adoption with the next GLUP reprinting.
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Major Planning Corridors
Arlington County has three Major Planning Corridors: 1) the Rosslyn-Ballston Metro Corridor which includes five Metro Station Areas; 2) the Jefferson Davis Metro Corridor which includes three Metro Station Areas and a future streetcar line and 3) the Columbia Pike Corridor which also includes a future streetcar line.

ROSSLYN-BALLSTON METRO CORRIDOR
The Rosslyn-Ballston Metro Corridor (R-B Corridor) is one of Arlington’s two Metrorail transit corridors targeted for high-density development. The R-B Corridor, approximately three quarters of a mile wide and three miles long, is located along Wilson Boulevard between the Potomac River and North Glebe Road. Five Orange Line stations, which opened between 1976 and 1979, are in this corridor: Rosslyn, Courthouse, Clarendon, Virginia Square/George Mason University and Ballston/Marymount University. The R-B Corridor is also well served by major thoroughfares including Washington Boulevard, Glebe Road, Arlington Boulevard, Lee Highway, and the Custis Parkway (I-66).

Planning for the R-B Corridor involved a twelve year intensive effort by citizens, staff and County officials. During this period, several policy planning studies were adopted, including RB 72, Alternative Land Use Patterns; Arlington Growth Patterns (1974); A Long Range County Improvement Program (1975); and Rosslyn Ballston Corridor: Recommended General Land Use Plan (1977). Between 1977 and 1984, sector plans were adopted for Rosslyn (1977), Ballston (1980), Court House (1981), Virginia Square (1983) and Clarendon (1984).

Attachment 3: Rosslyn Sector Plan Implementation
GLUP Amendments
In 1989, the County Board initiated a mid-course review of the R-B Corridor to evaluate the quality of development that had been achieved and determine how well the County was shaping the character of the Corridor and the individual Metro Stations. At the time of the review, the Corridor was just over fifty percent complete in terms of projected new development. This planning effort generated design recommendations that were followed by the adoption of sector plan addenda for Clarendon (1990), Rosslyn (1992 and 2015), and Courthouse (1993). In addition, the County Board adopted the East Clarendon: Special Coordinated Mixed-Use District Plan (1994) and the North Quincy Street Plan (1995), which also addressed recommendations made during the mid-course review process. The sector plans with the addenda provide detailed recommendations and policy guidelines for land use and zoning, urban design, transportation, utilities, parks and community facilities. Sector plan land use recommendations are incorporated into the General Land Use Plan.

In 2000, in order to reevaluate land use and urban design goals and objectives in several station areas along the R-B Corridor, the County Board initiated a review and update of the Virginia Square, Clarendon, and Rosslyn Sector Plans. After a community-wide planning process in the Virginia Square area in 2001 and 2002, the County Board adopted the 2002 Virginia Square Sector Plan. The County Board adopted a new Clarendon Sector Plan in 2006 and the Rosslyn Sector Plan in 2015.

In May 2001, the County Board adopted the Proposed Retail Street Maps and Urban Design Principles and Guidelines in the R-B Corridor Retail Action Plan. These elements help guide decisions on appropriate locations for retail uses and help guide design and function of retail development in the Corridor. In March 2003, the County Board adopted the Rosslyn to Courthouse Urban Design Study. The study defines redevelopment and reinvestment parameters and urban design guidelines for sites generally located between the Rosslyn and Courthouse Metro Station Areas. In September 2008, the County Board adopted the Fort Myer Heights North Plan, and the County Board adopted the Western Rosslyn Area Plan in July 2015.

Throughout the R-B Corridor, the General Land Use Plan concentrates the highest density uses within walking distance of Metro stations; tapers densities, heights and uses down to the existing single family residential neighborhoods; and provides for a mix of office, hotel, retail and residential development. Each station area serves a unique function: Rosslyn is a mixed-use gateway with Arlington’s greatest concentration of jobs, housing and activities a first class office and business center, Courthouse is Arlington County’s government center, and Clarendon is planned as an “urban village.” The Virginia Square/GMU Station Area contains a concentration of residential, cultural and educational facilities, while Ballston/Marymount University is developing as Arlington’s “new downtown.” These five station areas complement one another and constitute an urban corridor of increasing importance to the greater Arlington community. Special planning areas within each station area are described in detail below.
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**Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District**

On May 11, 1996, the County Board established the “Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District.” The purpose of this district is to encourage the physical and economic development of the Rosslyn area to maximize Rosslyn’s potential, over the next 25 years, to become a competitive first class urban center.
which exemplifies superior architecture and excellent urban design practice. This is envisioned to be achieved through the development of high quality mixed-use development at the core of Rosslyn including enhanced residential and hotel resources, and office buildings that are home to regional and national headquarters of major private/public corporations and institutions.

Through the site plan special exception process, the "Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District" allows, on sites designated "High" Office-Apartment-Hotel on the General Land Use Plan, a density of up to 3.8 floor area ratio (F.A.R.) for office/commercial uses and up to 4.8 F.A.R. for hotel and residential uses. On sites designated "High" Residential, the maximum density permitted is 4.8 F.A.R. for residential and 3.8 F.A.R. for hotel uses. This district also permits the rezoning of sites located within its boundaries to "C-O Rosslyn," Rosslyn Commercial Office Building, Retail, Hotel and Multiple-Family Dwelling Districts; Mixed Use Rosslyn District. However, the uses permitted on a particular site shall be limited to the uses permitted under the General Land Use Plan.

The "C-O Rosslyn" zoning district allows the County Board to approve additional building height and density when the County Board determines that the development proposal offers important community benefits—certain features, design elements, services, or amenities identified in approved plans for the area and meets other special exception criteria of the Zoning Ordinance. A site within the “Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District” is eligible to be rezoned to “C-O Rosslyn” through the site plan process when the proposed development of the site is consistent with the vision, goals, policies and recommendations included in the Rosslyn Sector Plan, adopted by the County Board in July 2015, and other plans and policies adopted by the County Board for the area. The vision, goals, policies and recommendations include the following, among others:

- A diverse mix of workplaces, housing, retail, and visitor destinations;
- A physical environment with an emphasis on walkability and the public realm;
- A “Peaks and Valleys” approach to building heights that protects priority view corridors, supports an appealing environment at the ground level, creates an attractive, distinctive skyline with varied heights, and ensures sensitive transitions to surrounding neighborhoods;
- A diverse network of public parks and opens spaces that engage the Potomac waterfront, provide active outdoor recreational opportunities and amenities for all ages and lifestyles, and provide opportunities for informal congregation, reflection, and meditation; and
- A transformed transportation network, including an enhanced system of complete streets, improvements to transit facilities and operations, and safer, more attractive and more accessible pedestrian and bicycle networks.

Within the "Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District," additional density and heights may be granted by the County Board, through the site plan process, for the provision of important community benefits and the development of a site in a manner consistent with the goals, objectives and design guidelines included in the Rosslyn Station Area Plan Addendum, adopted by the County Board in January, 1992, and other plans and policies adopted by the County Board for the area, which may include among others:

- The development of a mixed-use project with a significant residential component;
- The provision or enhancement of retail, restaurant and entertainment facilities in the center of Rosslyn;
- The provision or enhancement of the pedestrian, vehicular and mass transit circulation system;
- The provision of open space or other public facilities and/or amenities;
The creation of a "Central Place" and the "Esplanade" as envisioned in the Rosslyn Station Area Sector Plan Addendum; or
The provision of other community benefits

HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS
The following list of planning documents has been superseded by more recent versions of policies and guidelines for respective parts of the County and is listed here for historical context and information.

- Clarendon Sector Plan Addendum (1990)
- Courthouse Sector Plan (1981)
- Courthouse Sector Plan Addendum (1990)
- Rosslyn-Transit Station Area Study (1977)
- Virginia Square Sector Plan (1983)
- The Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor: Early Visions (1989)
- The Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor: Mid-Course Review (1989)
- Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor Retail Action Plan (2001)
- Resolution Governing Building Heights in Rosslyn (2002)
- Resolution on Urban Design Principles for Rosslyn Central Place (2007)

RESOLUTION GOVERNING BUILDING HEIGHTS IN ROSSLYN

WHEREAS the Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District ("RCRD") was created in 1996 and designated on the County's General Land Use Plan and sites within the "RCRD" have been rezoned to "C-O Rosslyn" and special exception site plans, with building heights up to 300 feet, may be approved by the County Board; and

WHEREAS the policies of the Arlington County General Land Use Plan and the Rosslyn Station Area Plan generally call for the greatest building heights to be focused closest to the Metro Station with building heights tapering down as locations are farther away from the station; and

WHEREAS the County Board believes that the skyline of the Rosslyn area, and areas outside the "RCRD" would benefit from the development of architecturally distinctive buildings, with the greatest heights focused around the Metro Station and tapering down in height toward the boundaries of the "RCRD"; and

WHEREAS the County Board finds that tapering of building heights as described in the previous paragraph will better provide for planning for improved use of land, will contribute to local economic development and to the furtherance of harmonious and attractive development in the County; and
WHEREAS the Board finds that the County’s General Land Use Plan and supporting documents, the Rosslyn Station Area Plan Addendum, and the Zoning Ordinance set forth the foregoing land use policies, which policies the Board wishes to emphasize through a statement of general principles pertaining to development within the “RCRD”,

THEREFORE the Arlington County Board hereby resolves that the following principles shall be used in considering the height and design of future site plans within the “RCRD” and directs the County Manager to consider these principles in the future planning of the Rosslyn Station area Plan update, and in future revisions to the “C-O Rosslyn” Zoning District:

- New buildings in the “RCRD” shall be architecturally distinctive with particular attention given to the design of the tops of the buildings and their impact on the Rosslyn Skyline;
- New buildings with the greatest building heights as permitted by site plan in the "C-O Rosslyn" Zoning District shall be generally located in the core of Rosslyn around the Metro station entrances; and
- Buildings farther from the core and closer to the boundary of the “RCRD” and adjacent to residential buildings shall generally taper down in height and shall be designed to achieve transitions to the adjacent planned and zoned land use densities and building heights in a way that furthers sound land use planning and good urban design
- Consideration shall also be given to the impact on "view corridors".
- Further refinement and General Land Use Plan amendments shall be considered within the framework of a comprehensive review of the Rosslyn Sector Plan

Adopted by the Arlington County Board on 9/17/02

RESOLUTION ON URBAN DESIGN PRINCIPLES FOR ROSSLYN CENTRAL PLACE

WHEREAS the Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District (“RCRD”) was adopted by the County Board in 1996 and designated on the County's General Land Use Plan; and

WHEREAS sites within the “RCRD” have been rezoned to “C-O Rosslyn” and on such rezoned sites special exception site plans, with building heights up to 300 feet, may be approved by the County Board; and

WHEREAS the policies of the Arlington County General Land Use Plan and the Rosslyn Station Area Plan generally call for the greatest building heights to be focused closest to the Metro Station with building heights tapering down as locations are farther away from the station; and

WHEREAS the Rosslyn Station Area Plan calls for the creation of a Central Place that is the hub of pedestrian and retail activity in Rosslyn with a unique character to its architecture and streetscape design;

WHEREAS the Arlington County Board passed a 2002 Resolution Governing Building Heights in Rosslyn that established general principles for considering height and design of future site plans within the RCRD; and
WHEREAS the Rosslyn Working Group was established by the County Manager to further consider planning principles relating to building height, land use and urban design within Central Place (defined as the two blocks bounded by North Lynn Street, 19th Street North, Fort Myer Drive, and Wilson Boulevard) and to make specific recommendations based on a thorough analysis of these principles;

THEREFORE the Arlington County Board hereby resolves that the following major principles shall be used in considering future site plans within Central Place:

Building, site, and streetscape designs should create clearly recognizable mid-block pedestrian connections and enhance overall connectivity to and from the Rosslyn Metro Station;

Project design should maximize, to the extent possible, retail, restaurant, entertainment, and commercial uses within the first and second floors of the building;

Despite existing variations in local topographic conditions, developments in Central Place should possess building base heights at generally uniform elevations;

Buildings should achieve the best feasible urban design with regard to such elements as: curbcuts, parking entrance consolidation, sidewalk clear width, retail activation, pedestrian-oriented units, and ground-level façade transparency along public street frontages; and

IN ADDITION, the Arlington County Board further resolves that the following major principles shall be used in considering additional building height above 300 feet for future site plans within Central Place:

Buildings should include distinctive architectural features such as sculpted rooftop designs or significant tapering in its building form and massing;

Projects should incorporate significant community amenities such as public access to views from building tops, public open space areas, or other important County goals for the Rosslyn area;

Any additional building height should preserve, to the extent feasible, views from any public observation deck (approved or built) within Central Place;

The design and construction of projects should incorporate best practices in energy conservation and excellence in sustainable architectural design;

Projects should otherwise be consistent with the principles included in the September 2002 County Board Resolution Governing Building Heights in Rosslyn;

Buildings should receive confirmation from the Federal Aviation Administration (F.A.A.) that the project is not a hazard to air navigation or that the project does not require notice to the F.A.A.

Adopted by the Arlington County Board on May 5, 2007
RESOLUTION ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE
MASTER TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MTP) MAP

WHEREAS, the County Board of Arlington County has been presented with proposed amendments of the Master Transportation Plan (“MTP”) Map, a part of the County’s Comprehensive Plan, to:

1. Amend the map on the front side of the MTP Map to remove the designation of “Area Planned For New Streets” labeled as #12, Rosslyn Redevelopment;

2. Amend the typology of streets, and add new segments of streets as indicated on Attachment 5; and

3. Amend the Bicycle and Trail Network Map on the back side of the MTP Map to change existing bicycle facilities and add new segments of bicycle and pedestrian facilities as indicated on Attachment 5; and

WHEREAS, the County Board of Arlington County has considered the foregoing recommendations and the purposes of the MTP Map and the Comprehensive Plan as set forth in these documents, the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance, and the Code of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the County Board of Arlington County held a duly advertised public hearing on the proposed amendments to the MTP Map on October 15, 2016.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that, based on the aforementioned considerations, deliberations and all public comments, the County Board of Arlington County hereby adopts the proposed amendments to the MTP Map set forth in Attachment 5.
Recommended Master Transportation Plan Amendment

LEGEND:
High Occupancy-Incentive Corridors
I-66, I-395, Va Rte 110, Va Rte 27
Limited Access Routes
Limited Access
Arterial Street Typologies
Type A
Type B
Type C
Type D
Type E
Type F
Neighborhood Streets
Urban Center Local
Residential or Commercial Local Street
Pedestrian Street
Public Transportation Facilities
Metro Orange & Silver Lines
Metro Blue Line
Public Parks
Federal Land

Master Transportation Map (front side of MTP Map)

Proposed Changes to Existing Street Types:
1. 19th St. N. between Fort Myer Dr. and N. Lynn St. (from Type B to Type A)
2. Fort Myer Dr. between Wilson Blvd. and 19th St. N. (from Type B to Type A)
3. Wilson Blvd. between Fort Myer Dr. and N. Lynn St. (from Type B to Type A)
4. N. Lynn St. between Wilson Blvd. and 19th St. N. (from Type B to Type A)
5. N. Nash St. between Key Blvd. and Lee Hwy. westbound (from Type B to Urban Center Local)
6. N. Nash St. between Wilson Blvd. and 17th St. N. (from Type B to Urban Center Local)
7. 17th St. N. between N. Nash St. and Fort Myer Dr. (from Type B to Urban Center Local)

Proposed New Streets:
8. N. Ode St. between 18th St. N. and Clarendon Blvd. (Urban Center Local)
9. N. Nash St. between 17th St. N. and Fairfax Dr. (Urban Center Local)
10. 18th St. N. between N. Lynn St. and N. Arlington Ridge Rd. (Urban Center Local)
11. 17th St. N. between N. Kent St. and N. Arlington Ridge Rd. (Urban Center Local)
12. 17th St. N. extension between Fort Myer Dr. and N. Kent St. (Pedestrian Street)
13. N. Orme St. between Wilson Blvd. and Clarendon Blvd. (Pedestrian Street)
14. N. Orme St. between 18th St. N. and Wilson Blvd. (Pedestrian Street)
15. 18th St. N. between N. Oak St. and N. Lynn St. (Pedestrian Street)
16. 20th St. N. between N. Nash St. and Fort Myer Dr. (Pedestrian Street)

Areas Planned For New Streets
Rosslyn-Courthouse Area
Rosslyn Redevelopment

Remove Area Planned for New Streets

Map prepared by Arlington County, Va. GIS Mapping Center
February 2016
Bicycle and Trail Network Map (back side of MTP map)

Legend
- Bike Lane
- Off Street Trail
- On Street Route
  - Planned Bike Lane
  - Planned Off Street Trail
  - Planned On Street Route
- Public Parks
- Federal-Owned Land

Proposed Changes to Existing Bicycle Facilities:
- **A**: N. Nash St. (Fort Myer Dr. to Wilson Blvd.)
  (from On-Street Route to Bike Lane)
- **B**: Wilson Blvd. (N. Nash St. to N. Lynn St.)
  (from On-Street Route to Bike Lane)
- **C**: N. Lynn St. (Wilson Blvd. to Fairfax Dr.)
  (from On-Street Route to Bike Lane)

Proposed New Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities:
1. Rosslyn Esplanade (Rosslyn Circle to Iwo Jima)
2. Freedom Park Trail (Fort Myer Dr. to 19th St. N.)
4. Arlington Blvd. Trail (N. Rhodes St. to Fort Myer Dr.)
5. N. Meade St. (Fairfax Dr. to Marshall Dr.)
6. 19th St. N. (Fort Myer Dr. to N. Kent St.)
7. Wilson Blvd. (N. Lynn St. to N. Arlington Ridge Rd.)
8. 18th St. N. (N. Arlington Ridge Rd. to N. Lynn St.)
9. N. Moore St. (19th St. N. to Wilson Blvd.)
10. N. Nash St. (Lee Hwy. to Key Blvd.)
11. N. Nash St. - 17th St. N. (Clarendon Blvd. to Fort Myer Dr.)

Map prepared by Arlington County, Va. GIS Mapping Center
August 2016
Map Scale 1:9600
1" = 800'
Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments

ORDINANCE TO AMEND, REENACT AND RECODIFY THE ARLINGTON COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE, §7.15 C-O ROSSLYN, MIXED USE ROSSLYN DISTRICT, AS SHOWN IN ATTACHMENT 7, TO REVISE PROVISIONS FOR ADDITIONAL BUILDING HEIGHT AND DENSITY, REMOVE THE LANDSCAPED OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENT, RETAIL AND STREETSCAPE PROVISIONS, AND MAKE OTHER CONSISTENCY AND FORMATTING CHANGES TO FACILITATE THE VISION OF THE ROSSLYN SECTOR PLAN; AND IN ORDER TO REDUCE OR PREVENT CONGESTION IN THE STREETS, FACILITATE THE CREATION OF A CONVENIENT, ATTRACTIVE AND HARMONIOUS COMMUNITY, ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR OTHER REASONS REQUIRED BY THE PUBLIC NECESSITY, CONVENIENCE AND GENERAL WELFARE, AND GOOD ZONING PRACTICE.

Be it ordained that the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance, §7.15 C-O Rosslyn, Mixed Use Rosslyn District, is hereby amended, reenacted and recodified, as shown in Attachment 7, to modify provisions for additional building height and density, remove the landscaped open space requirement, retail and streetscape provisions, and make other consistency and formatting changes to facilitate the vision of the Rosslyn Sector Plan; and in order to reduce or prevent congestion in the streets, facilitate the creation of a convenient, attractive and harmonious community, encourage economic development, and for other reasons required by the public necessity, convenience and general welfare, and good zoning practice.
In the proposed amendment, text proposed to be added is shown with underline and text proposed to be removed is shown with strikethrough.

Where paragraphs are inserted, all subsequent paragraphs and references throughout the Ordinance will be updated (renumbered or relettered) accordingly.

For proposed revisions to the advertised version of the proposed amendment, text proposed to be added is shown with double-underline and text proposed to be removed is shown with double-strikethrough.

**Article 7. Commercial/ Mixed Use (C) Districts**

**§7.1. Commercial/Mixed Use (C) Districts Use Tables**

---

**§7.15. C-O Rosslyn, Mixed Use Rosslyn District**

**§7.15.1. Purpose**

The purpose of the C-O Rosslyn, Mixed Use Rosslyn District is to encourage a mixed-use development of office, retail and service commercial, hotel and multiple-family dwelling uses within the Rosslyn Metro station Area and the area designated as the Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District on the General Land Use Plan. When a lot is located in the area designated Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District on the General Land Use Plan, site plans may be approved by the County Board. Determination as to the actual types and densities of uses to be allowed will be based on the characteristics of the site and its location, and on the extent to which the proposed site plan for development, redevelopment or rehabilitation of the site meets the standards of this section and accomplishes the policies and recommendations contained in the Rosslyn Station Area Plan Addendum and other plans and policies established for the area by the County Board. The goals of this district are to:

A. **Advance the vision of Rosslyn established in the Rosslyn Sector Plan;**

B. **Support a diverse mix of uses, including workplaces, housing, retail, and visitor destinations;**

C. **Create a high quality public realm with an emphasis on walkability and a diverse network of public parks, open spaces, and tree-lined streets;**

D. **Implement a peaks and valleys approach to building heights that, among other goals, preserves priority public view corridors, supports an appealing environment at the ground level, creates an attractive, distinctive skyline with varied heights, and ensures sensitive transitions to surrounding neighborhoods;**

E. **Transform Rosslyn’s transportation network, including an enhanced system of complete streets, improvements to transit facilities and operations, and safer, more attractive and more accessible pedestrian and bicycle networks; and**

F. **Achieve superior architecture and the best in urban design practice.**

G. **Create premier office space suitable for regional and national headquarters of major corporations, institutions and international firms;**
H. Provide hotels that expand and enhance hotel services for Rosslyn and Arlington County businesses, residents, and visitors;

I. Provide residential development that meets the housing goals and policies of Arlington County;

J. Implement urban design, streetscape and open space plans and policies, including the central place, the esplanade and other public facilities;

K. Achieve the policy objectives for increasing retail commercial services in the center of Rosslyn; and

§7.15.2. Uses

Uses shall be as specified in §7.1. and special exception site plans as previously approved by the County Board, subject to all conditions of approval and any future amendments which the County Board may approve.

§7.15.3. Density and dimensional standards

A. By-right

Development allowed by-right in the C-O Rosslyn district shall comply with the following standards, except as otherwise expressly allowed or stated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Single-family Dwellings</th>
<th>All Other Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot area, minimum (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width (feet)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, maximum (feet)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor area ratio, maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site area up to 9,999</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site area 10,000 to 19,999</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site area 20,000 and above</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Special exception

Development allowed by special exception in the C-O Rosslyn district shall comply with the following standards, except as otherwise approved by the County Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Office, Retail, Service Commercial</th>
<th>Multiple-family Dwellings</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot area, minimum (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width, average (feet)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, maximum, including penthouse and parapet walls (feet)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor area ratio, maximum</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Exceptions

(a) See §7.15.4. for provisions for additional density and height.

(b) The County Board may approve application for rezoning to the C-O Rosslyn District where a lot or plot having less width or less area is part of a block surrounded by streets and/or buildings that generally comply with the provisions of this section.
C. Bulk, coverage and placement

For bulk, coverage and placement requirements not listed in this section see §3.2.

§7.15.4. Provisions for additional density and height

In considering the approval of a site plan the County Board may approve additional density and height above that provided in §7.15.3.B where it finds that the development project is consistent with the Rosslyn Sector Plan, offers certain features, design elements, services, or amenities identified in the Rosslyn Sector Plan, and meets §15.5.5 and other special exception criteria of the Zoning Ordinance. In considering such modification, the County Board may also consider characteristics of the site and the area as described in §15.5.7. The provisions of §15.5.9 for the approval of additional height and density shall not be applicable in the C-O Rosslyn district, and under no circumstances shall the provisions of §15.5.7.A be used for the approval of additional density or height. The approval of additional height and density, under the foregoing, shall be subject to the following:

A. Exceptions—Density

1. Under no circumstances shall the County Board approve density above 10.0 FAR; except where it finds that the development project is consistent with the building height and form guidelines of the Rosslyn Sector Plan, the County Board may approve density above 10.0 FAR only as follows:

(a) Where it finds that additional density is necessary to physically accommodate either a new segment(s) of 18th Street North; or infrastructure that substantially increases capacity of the Metrorail system (such as a new Metro station, platform, tunnel, entrance(s), or the like), provided that, in accordance with §7.15.4.B.2, under no circumstances shall building height above that shown on the building heights map in the Rosslyn Sector Plan be approved if additional density is granted under this §7.15.4.A.1(a); and/or

(b) Where the additional density is achieved through the transfer of development rights, as provided in §15.5.7.B.

2. No portion of the site shall be used more than one time in computing the permitted density. All mechanical penthouse area in excess of that used for elevator, mechanical, or maintenance equipment shall be counted as gross floor area.

B. Building height

1. The County Board may approve additional height above that provided in §7.15.3.B, exclusive of mechanical penthouses and parapet walls, up to the building height on the building heights map and consistent with the step-backs and neighborhood transitions shown on the building heights map in the Rosslyn Sector Plan, where it finds the development project is consistent with the peaks and valleys building heights policy of the Rosslyn Sector Plan, including but not limited to:

(a) Priority view corridors from the public observation deck are preserved;
(b) The development project contributes to a distinctive and dynamic skyline with varied heights and architectural expression;

(c) The development project provides a transition in scale and height to surrounding lower density neighborhoods;

(d) The design of the development project considers opportunities for daylight for public parks and open spaces envisioned in the Rosslyn Sector Plan; and

(e) The development project provides an appealing, pedestrian-scaled street environment.

2. The County Board may approve variations from height, step-backs and neighborhood height transitions shown on the building heights map in the Rosslyn Sector Plan based on site specific considerations where it finds the development project is otherwise consistent with the findings of §7.15.4.B.1, provided that under no circumstances shall building height above that shown on the building heights map in the Rosslyn Sector Plan be approved to accommodate additional density granted if additional density is granted under §7.15.4.A.1(a) or to allow a building height greater than 470 feet above sea level, inclusive of mechanical penthouses and parapet walls.

3. Provision for additional density and height

(a) In considering the approval of a site plan the County Board may permit additional density, above 3.8 floor area ratio (FAR) for office, retail and service commercial uses, above 4.8 F.A.R. for hotels and multiple-family dwellings, and above the existing density on a site when it is already greater than 3.8 F.A.R. for office, retail and service commercial uses, or above 4.8 F.A.R. for hotels and multiple-family dwellings, up to maximum of 10.0 F.A.R. and/or height up to a maximum of 300 feet. Increases in density and height may be approved when the County Board finds that the development proposal offers important community benefits identified in approved plans for the area and meets the other special exception criteria of the zoning ordinance. In considering such modification, the County Board may also consider characteristics of the site and the area as described in §15.5.7 and the plans and policies adopted for the area. Provisions of §15.5.9 for the approval of additional height and density shall not be applicable in the C-O Rosslyn district. Under no circumstances shall application of the modification of use provisions of §15.5.7 be applied to permit a density of more than 10.0 F.A.R. or a height of more than 300 feet except as described below. To enable the county to provide for adequate streets the County Board may grant additional density (F.A.R.) within the height limit up to an amount that would be permitted if any area dedicated from the site for street purposes were permitted to be counted in calculating density.

(b) To enable the county to achieve an enhanced Rosslyn skyline and other community amenities the County Board may grant additional height up to maximum of 490 feet above sea level for projects within Central Place (defined as the area bounded by 19th Street N., N. Lynn Street, Wilson Boulevard, and Fort Myer Drive). Development subject to site plan approval pursuant to §15.5 within Central Place may be approved when the County Board finds a project is generally consistent
with the May 5, 2007 County Board Resolution on Urban Design Principles for Rosslyn Central Place, and additionally meets the standards of §15.5.5.

4. Lot area and width

(a) The County Board may authorize application for rezoning to the C-O Rosslyn District where a lot or plot having less width or less area is part of a block surrounded by streets and/or buildings that generally comply with the provisions of this section.

§7.15.5. District use standards

Use standards applicable to specific uses in the C-O Roslyn district include:

A. [Reserved]

§7.15.6. Site development standards

The site development standards of Article 13 and Article 14 apply to all development, except as otherwise specified below.

A. Retail and service commercial uses when allowed by the General Land Use Plan

In site plan projects, retail and service commercial uses, when allowed by the General Land Use Plan, shall be provided and located as described in the Rosslyn Station Area Plan Addendum. Primary retail and service commercial uses shall generally be located at the street level and on the streets identified for such uses in the Rosslyn Station Area Plan Addendum. Secondary retail and service commercial uses shall generally be located on levels other than the street level and off the street frontages or in areas designated for secondary retail and service commercial uses in the Rosslyn Station Area Plan Addendum.

B. Landscaping

20 percent of total site area is required to be landscaped open space in accordance with the requirements of §14.2, Landscaping. The County Board may modify landscaping requirements by site plan approval when the County Board finds that the proposed site plan accomplishes the policies and recommendations contained in the Rosslyn Station Area Plan Addendum and other plans and policies established for the area by the County Board.

C. Parking and loading

Parking and loading shall be regulated as specified and regulated in §14.3, and as specified below, except that the County Board may specify and modify parking regulations by site plan approval.

1. Parking requirements

(a) Dwelling unit

One off-street parking space shall be provided for each dwelling unit.

(b) Hotel

0.7 off-street parking space for each guest room and dwelling unit.

2. The parking provided shall be located below grade or within the structure housing the use to which the parking is appurtenant, except as may be allowed in an
Approved site plan. Off-street loading spaces for all permitted uses shall be provided as specified in §14.3.

3. Transportation Demand Management plans shall be required to be approved as part of any site plan approval unless determined otherwise by the County Board.

(c) Office, retail and service commercial uses

Office and retail and service commercial parking may be approved within a range between the rate of one off-street parking space for each 530 sq. ft. of office, retail and service commercial gross floor area and the rate of one off-street parking space for each to 1,000 sq. ft. of office and retail and service commercial gross floor area depending on the adequacy of the Transportation Demand Management plan in addressing the need for parking.

4. Additional parking requirements

(a) The parking provided shall be located below grade or within the structure housing the use to which the parking is appurtenant.

(b) Short-term, convenient parking shall be provided for customers of commercial tenant retailers when the business premises are open to the public for business.

(c) Transportation Demand Management plans shall be required to be approved as part of any site plan approval unless determined otherwise by the County Board.

§7.15.7. Streetscape

Streetscapes, including curb, gutter, sidewalk, street light, street furniture, landscaping and other elements, shall be provided as contained in the Rosslyn Station Area Plan Addendum, and other plans and policies established for the area by the County Board.
### Rosslyn Sector Plan Implementation: GLUP, MTP and Zoning Ordinance Amendments

**Comment-Response Matrix**  (updated 9/26/16)

Comments are organized based on the LRPC/ZOCO meeting date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Source/Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GLUP Map Text</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>Description of Rosslyn as having the “greatest concentration” of activities is not accurate; consider different language such as “varied activities”</td>
<td>This language is intended as a vision statement, not as a reflection of current conditions. The statement is consistent with the vision statement in the Rosslyn Sector Plan (page 49), so staff proposes utilizing the same text in the GLUP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>Existing bullet regarding preservation areas should be updated to better reflect all the residential areas surrounding the RCRD, including River Place; consider also whether the description reflects the current intent for these areas.</td>
<td>This bullet is intended to reflect planning guidance, not current conditions. The Rosslyn Sector Plan recommends that future planning will need to be done for the River Place site (page 89). Upon further evaluation, the bullets provided under Plan features are intended to reference the primary planning document of the station area (in this case the Rosslyn Sector Plan and the Rosslyn Station Area Addendum). Therefore, staff recommends removing the previously proposed Western Rosslyn Area Plan bullet and expanding the preservation bullet to note the intent to preserve Colonial Village and Radnor-Fort Myer Heights. Proposed edits can be found <a href="#">here</a>. Further, with the next reprinting of the GLUP, staff will review the GLUP map descriptions of Plan Features for all the station areas to ensure that they are presented consistently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>Somewhat confusing to describe “Plan features” when, in fact, there are multiple plans for each station area.</td>
<td>As noted above, with the reprinting of the GLUP, staff will review the GLUP map descriptions of Plan Features for all the station areas to ensure that they are presented consistently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Resident, 2/16</td>
<td>Existing bullet regarding preservation areas should refer to Radnor-Fort Myer Heights, not Fort Myer Heights.</td>
<td>Staff agrees and this bullet has been amended. Proposed edits can be found <a href="#">here</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GLUP Booklet Text</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>It’s not appropriate to strike “over the next 25 years” from the description of the RCRD; the timeframe acts as a reminder that plans need to be refreshed over time.</td>
<td>The sentence in the GLUP is describing the purpose of the RCRD, which is not limited to a 25-year timeframe. Staff does not agree with keeping this text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>When describing &quot;C-O Rosslyn&quot; zoning district, clarify that additional height and</td>
<td>The language in the GLUP states that the “C-O Rosslyn” zoning district allows the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>Are bullets just examples or meant to be complete description of the plan’s vision and goals?</td>
<td>Yes, the list is a summary of highlights and not inclusive of all the vision, goals, policies and recommendations in the Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MTP Street Typologies**

| 8. | LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16 | Addition of new street typology should be part of a broader County-wide process and discussion, rather than grouped together with Rosslyn implementation. | The proposed new Pedestrian Street typology is the subject of a separate County-wide proposed MTP amendment. |
| 9. | LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16 | What is the significance of changing streets from Type A to Type B? Staff responded that the types reflect the intended mixed-use character and anticipated level of activity. | The types reflect the intended mixed-use character and anticipated level of activity. |

**MTP Bike and Trail Network Map**

| 10. | LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16 | The bicycle element of the MTP has not been updated to differentiate between bike lanes and cycle tracks. Can these be distinguished from one another on the map? | The County has long-term plans to update the bicycle element, but this has not been done yet. Therefore, the map will reflect the current bike lane typologies. |
| 11. | TC Member, email, 3/17/16 | Why doesn’t the Potomac River Connector trail get a call-out under Key Facilities like the Rosslyn Circle Tunnel and Iwo Jima connection to Roosevelt Bridge do? | The Potomac River Connector Trail is listed as a “Proposed New Bicycle Facility” because it will be an addition to the MTP Map. The other two facilities that were mentioned are listed separately because they are currently shown on the MTP Map and therefore are not additions. There is no implication that it is less important than the other facilities. |

**Zoning Framework**

<p>| 12. | LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16 | Can staff provide examples of project/site-specific conditions that would warrant a modification of the heights map? | Examples include site grade or orientation, location of the line delineating split-height zones in a single block, accommodation of a creative rooftop or step-back solutions, increased differentiation between tower heights in multi-tower site plans, and other unanticipated circumstances. |
| 13. | LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16 | Where in the Plan is the basis for Option 3? | The Plan recommends that the Zoning Ordinance address heights, but it does not recommend the manner in which height is regulated. Option 3 is one approach. |
| 14. | LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16 | Could you codify heights for each site without a map? | Yes, height could be codified in other ways through text. For example, the “MU-VS” district codifies heights by block through text. Alternatively, the Zoning Ordinance can reference the height map without incorporating the map into the Zoning Code. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>How would Option 3 ensure neighborhood transitions if all buildings could be proposed at 390’?</td>
<td>This option would require that the County Board make a finding that a site plan is consistent with the recommendations of the Plan, and as such, it could be extremely difficult/impossible for 390’ buildings on certain sites to be approved with such findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>Is the criteria for “upholding vision goals and recommendations” meant to include all elements of the Plan?</td>
<td>Yes, the Zoning Ordinance will reference the policy guidance of the Plan in its entirety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>How are single-tower sites defined?</td>
<td>The illustrative plan in the Plan shows single-tower sites based on assumptions made during modeling. However, determination would be made at the time of final site plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>Are there any districts that have no height caps?</td>
<td>Yes, several of the C-O districts do not have an ultimate height limit and can be modified through bonus provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>Is there a way to incorporate review process in the ZO (e.g., a project with no modifications has a faster process than one with modifications)?</td>
<td>The review process and timing is governed by §15.5 and Administrative Regulation 4.1. Staff does not recommend codifying a Rosslyn-specific site plan process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>Recommend codifying the map and limiting the flexibility – either by only allowing the height of single-tower sites below 300’ to be modified or by providing strong criteria and a maximum height limit/maximum amount of modification. The zoning should ensure that modifications only are granted in unique circumstances.</td>
<td>In the resolution adopted with the Plan, the County Board gave clear direction that the property owners should be able to offer alternative creative solutions or proposals consistent with the stated goals of the Plan to be considered as part of the site plan review process. Therefore, the Zoning Ordinance should allow for some flexibility in building height. Rather than incorporate a map and allow for multiple ways to modify it, staff believes that referencing the map and codifying goals of the Plan more strongly enforces the Plan recommendations related to height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>Include strong findings for height modifications; consider criteria on page 168 as a starting point for developing criteria.</td>
<td>The proposed amendments include strong findings, based on the goals of the plan, the peaks and valleys approach to building height, and the criteria for height flexibility. With this approach, the County Board would have to find a site plan consistent with the findings in order to grant the height in the Plan or allow for height above that in the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>The zoning text should place the burden to justify a variation from the Plan on the applicant rather than on the SPRC. Leaving the map out of the Zoning Ordinance would place the burden on SPRC to raise</td>
<td>While the proposed amendments do not incorporate the map into the zoning code, the proposed text does place the burden on the applicant to justify a variation from the Plan. First, the base special exception heights are a starting point and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>Concerns about the deviations from the Plan. County Board may approve “up to” heights in the Plan based on findings. The applicant will need to demonstrate that the site plan meets each of the findings included in the ordinance. Further, in order to allow a site plan to exceed height on the map, the County Board must review the findings again, and ensure that the proposal with the additional height still meets the findings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Property owner, Letter, 3/11/16</td>
<td>Plan provides a strong vision, but it does not need to be codified. Flexibility should be provided and ultimately evaluated through the site plan process. The proposed amendments strike a balance between providing flexibility and ensuring that the vision and goals of the Plan will be upheld. The map is referenced but not incorporated directly into the zoning code, and the findings provide strong guidance for evaluating the height of all site plan proposals above the base special exception heights.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16</td>
<td>Key considerations include neighborhood transitions, step-backs, public view corridors, peaks and valleys goals, predictability, and flexibility for specific, challenging circumstances. Many of these considerations are included in the findings, and staff continued to review and edit the proposed findings throughout the public process in order to best reflect the Plan guidance. While flexibility inherently lowers the amount of predictability, the strong findings and reference to the height map ensure that the Plan’s policies provide a starting point for review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Property owner, email, 3/16/16</td>
<td>The scope of the re-write should not expand beyond minimum updates necessary to implement the Plan. The intent of the Zoning Ordinance amendment process is to implement the vision and recommendations of the Rosslyn Sector Plan. As such, the amendments will reflect the Plan recommendation to only address the density, height and step-back elements of the building height and form guidelines in the Zoning Ordinance. Further, the County Board’s direction regarding flexibility for creative solutions, as provided in the resolution adopted with the Plan, has informed the proposed zoning approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Rosslyn BID, email, 3/17/16</td>
<td>Narrowly restrict the scope of proposed revisions to the Zoning Ordinance to provide maximum flexibility consistent with the intent of the Realize Rosslyn Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Property owner, email, 3/16/16</td>
<td>Consider how to adjust the height map for Rosslyn Plaza Phase 1 to reflect the approved height of up to 275-feet. The proposed amendments do not include a map or specific heights in the text. The height of 270’ for Rosslyn Plaza Phase 1 will remain as recommended in the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The goal of the Zoning Ordinance amendment is to implement the Plan, and as proposed, would permit the County Board to approve heights above those recommended in the Plan.

| 29. | Land use attorney, email, 3/22/16 | The language in option 1 is too ambiguous to become law - the term "single tower sites" is not defined in the proposed ordinance. In the Plan it says "for any site on Map 1.2 with a building height limit below 300 feet as depicted on Map 3.16 that can only fit one building tower" a height modification is possible. You can build more than one tower on any site. While this is appropriate planning language, you can't port this into the Zoning Ordinance - it is ill-defined and too ambiguous to be law. This can really trip up a property owner that changes plans and wants to use multiple towers somewhere. Accordingly, we would advocate for option 2 or 3. | Rather than call out the single-tower sites as having different criteria than other height modifications, staff concluded that it was appropriate to reinforce that all projects must meet the core goals of the peaks and valleys approach. The proposed text would require the County Board to find that the proposal is consistent with the Plan, including, where appropriate, the single-tower height flexibility recommendations. |

<p>| Public Review Process | 30. Property owner, email, 3/16/16 | • Staff should provide proposed revisions to the Ordinance as soon as possible that in their professional judgment best reflect what the County Board requested via the adopted Sector Plan and Resolution; • Following this, the ZOCO committee, affected property owners, and others should have ample and equal opportunity to review and discuss the proposed revisions with Staff and request any changes; • The ZOCO Committee should add seats for NAIOP, EDC, Chamber, affected property owners and others as may be necessary to provide more balanced representation; and • The County Board should designate a ZOCO Liaison that will attend all of the meetings. | • Draft amendments were provided in advance of the April 12, May 25 and July 12 ZOCO meetings, and each revision reflected changes in response to comments received at the previous meeting and through other outreach efforts. • Staff was committed to a broad-based, balanced and ongoing engagement throughout the Rosslyn Zoning Ordinance amendment process. The draft text was shared for review and comment by all stakeholders, this comment/response matrix was regularly updated throughout the process, and shared prior to each ZOCO meeting. It has been updated for attachment to and County Board reports to reflect the most updated comments and responses. Staff welcomes all feedback and reached out to stakeholder groups to offer meetings throughout the process. • ZOCO is a committee of the Planning Commission, and meeting participation is at the discretion of the ZOCO chair. The Rosslyn Process Panel |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>matrix, to be called out and discussed in subsequent ZOCO meetings;</td>
<td>was invited to participate to provide continuity from the Rosslyn Sector Plan process. Further, the chair took comments from the general public at both the May 25 and July 12 ZOCO meetings. Also, as stated above, staff contacted stakeholder groups to offer briefings throughout the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure a more balanced discussion at ZOCO by adding a seat for the Economic Development Commission and NAIOP and/or the Chamber and by providing an opportunity for public comment during the ZOCO meetings; and</td>
<td>• Additionally, staff briefed the County Manager and, as needed, County Board members, throughout the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The County Board should designate a ZOCO liaison that will attend all of the meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Source/Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Please attribute the comments to a source in the comment response matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Staff should continue to consider an option with the height map codified which would addresses these preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Is it staff’s position that both the map/no map options are consistent with the Board resolution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 4/12/16; PC member, email, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Strike “equally” from line 104 and consider repeating findings or otherwise providing guidance as to how the Board will find a proposal “better”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 4/12/16</td>
<td>There should be a stronger reference to the Plan height map in draft text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZOCO, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Consider a reference to County-wide and other policies (urban design, open space) in the zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 4/12/16 PC Member, email, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Why set the maximum height at 470 feet above sea level (asl), instead of 390 feet above average site elevation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 4/12/16</td>
<td>How do we enforce varied heights? If a variation occurs, would staff look at impacts on neighboring properties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Findings don’t include impacts on adjacent buildings as referenced in the Plan’s policies (B1.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Concern that the findings are not specific enough and at the discretion of the Board; this does not provide predictability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. ZOCO, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Concerned that goals of TDR policy (e.g., affordable housing) may outweigh competing Plan objectives; need to reinforce that Plan goals and findings must still be met with TDRs</td>
<td>In order to grant additional density and height under §7.15.4., the County Board must find that a development project is consistent with the Rosslyn Sector Plan. This will ensure that a project with TDRs meets the Plan goals. In addition, regardless of the density proposed or the manner in which it is achieved, the height findings (§7.15.4.A.2(a) and (b)) would need to be met when height above the special exception base height is proposed. The proposed text for density above 10.0 FAR (§7.15.4.A.1) was revised to reiterate that density may be granted when it is consistent with the building height and form guidelines of the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. ZOCO, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Could TDRs be used to create open spaces in Rosslyn?</td>
<td>Under the proposed amendment, a C-O Rosslyn project would be eligible to use the TDR provisions (§15.5.7.B). The TDR provisions state that the County Board may grant TDR for a number of purposes, including open space. TDRs would further be guided by the adopted TDR policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. ZOCO, 4/12/16 NAIOP, 4/13/16 Chamber of Commerce, 4/20/16</td>
<td>Consider expanding provisions of transformational infrastructure to allow contributions (don’t define it specifically as 18th Street or something on-site)</td>
<td>The impetus for the recommendation in the Plan emerged from the desire to physically achieve 18th Street North on certain challenged redevelopment sites. It was not intended as a mechanism for achieving additional contributions or off-site improvements. Therefore, staff does not recommend broadly expanding the provision as suggested. However, staff concurs that a second Metro station that would substantially increase Metrorail capacity is a similar transformational infrastructure project that may need particular sites to redevelop in order to be achieved, and therefore the revised draft expands the transformational infrastructure provision to also include substantial expansion of Metrorail capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. ZOCO, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Consider expanding definition of transformational infrastructure but limiting it to elements that would need to be physically built on a site (e.g., second Metro station); other benefits are primarily funding needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. ZOCO, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Be clearer about density and height regulations and how they work together; preliminary text is not clear regarding what height or other provisions do/do not apply when density exceeds 10.0 FAR</td>
<td>The proposed text was revised to provide additional clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 47.| ZOCO, 4/12/16 | Email, 4/12/16 | • Concern that by removing 20% open space requirement we will be at a disadvantage in achieving contributions toward parks in community benefits  
• Would there be a scenario where a developer isn’t contributing to the open space goals of the plan and is also not constructing open space on its parcel?  
• Explore mechanism for requiring park and/or park contributions | Landscaped open space is not defined in the Zoning Ordinance, is not defined to be public, and is not utilized to negotiate off-site park improvements.  
The Plan provides guidance for considering park and open space improvements as part of a project’s community benefits. The Plan recommends that community benefit contributions be strategically focused to accomplish elements of the Plan more effectively. This approach would allow the County Board to make decisions about how to best focus community benefits during the site plan process, based on a site’s location and corresponding on-site or adjacent improvements, County priorities at the time of approval, and timing of infrastructure or park improvements. Requiring an open space contribution as part of the Zoning Ordinance is not consistent with the Plan guidance and would remove the ability to make strategic decisions at the time of site plan approval.  
Staff continues to recommend removing the landscaped open space requirement.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 48.| Chamber of Commerce, 4/20/16 | | It’s not clear how community benefits are calculated and improvements will be built; if not in the Zoning, there should be a discussion of how this will occur in order to provide more guidance | Per §7.15.4, in order to approve additional height and density above the base special exception provisions, the County Board must find that a development project offers certain features, design elements, services or amenities identified in the Plan. Therefore, projects would earn the additional density and height by providing elements of the Plan, potentially including off-site improvements. As stated in the response to #47, above, staff does not recommend codifying detailed requirements for community benefits as this would limit the ability to make strategic decisions at the time of site plan approval.  
Staff continues to recommend removing the landscaped open space requirement.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
<p>| 49.| ZOCO, 4/12/16 | | Did modeling for sector plan include 20% open space? | No, 20% landscaped open space was not modeled.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 50.| ZOCO, 4/12/16 | | The Plan recommends soil volume for street trees; could there be a soil volume requirement in ZO? | Soil volumes are better established through the site plan and/or landscape plan process based on policies and standards in place at the time. Staff does not recommend codifying a requirement for soil volume.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Do other plans have such a strong suggestion of modification as this?</td>
<td>The Zoning Ordinance implementation of other sector or area plans has been varied, with some only including a maximum height for the district (e.g. Fort Myer Heights North) and others allowing limited to no modifications of height (e.g. Clarendon, Crystal City). Staff provided a graphic comparing different zoning districts in the April 12 ZOCO presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Support the preliminary text as drafted which provides the Board the ability to respond to unanticipated changes while still meeting Plan goals</td>
<td>Staff concurs. The proposed zoning text was revised several times, in response to comments received throughout the process; the proposed text continues to allow the County Board to consider variations in height, step-backs and neighborhood transitions shown in the plan, in order to respond to site-specific circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 4/12/16 (member of general public in attendance)</td>
<td>Provide a map that demonstrates how tall buildings could be if maxed out at 470’</td>
<td>Staff has drafted an informational map that demonstrates the estimated heights above sea level. The map will be posted on the Rosslyn Implementation webpage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 4/12/16 (member of general public)</td>
<td>Need to be clear that the Plan recommended height is in no way guaranteed; if there is an argument for lower height for a specific project, that should be considered by the County Board.</td>
<td>The zoning text clearly requires that an applicant justify heights up to the building heights map. A building may need to be lower than the building heights map to meet one or more findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 4/12/16 (member of general public)</td>
<td>The Plan process resulted in a heights policy but it did not contemplate how the Zoning would be structured; support the text as drafted that requires justifying heights above the base rather than codifying the map and ways to modify it</td>
<td>The C-O Rosslyn regulations are generally applicable to the zoning district, while a PDSP provides specific approvals for a site. Under the current and proposed regulations, the County Board may modify certain zoning requirements with a site plan approval. It is not appropriate or necessary to call out the specifics of the PDSP in the zoning. The findings are consistent with the Rosslyn Sector Plan and would be applicable to future site plans in the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Property Owner, email, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Make sure that the provisions acknowledge the special role played by PDSPs such as Rosslyn Plaza. The zoning text should acknowledge prior PDSP approvals by the County Board, so that a project is not required to re-prove that it meets the findings.</td>
<td>The C-O Rosslyn regulations are generally applicable to the zoning district, while a PDSP provides specific approvals for a site. Under the current and proposed regulations, the County Board may modify certain zoning requirements with a site plan approval. It is not appropriate or necessary to call out the specifics of the PDSP in the zoning. The findings are consistent with the Rosslyn Sector Plan and would be applicable to future site plans in the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Property Owner, email, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Modify the height finding with regard to sunlight so that it states: “the development project is designed in a manner that increases sunlight exposure</td>
<td>Staff has further evaluated the findings to ensure they are consistent with the Plan goals related to height and can be effectively used to evaluate projects. The sunlight finding has been edited to state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to public parks and open spaces during expected peak usage periods; and&quot;</td>
<td>that the design of the development projects should consider opportunities for daylight for parks and open spaces envisioned in the Rosslyn Sector Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Property owner, email, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Modify the commercial parking provisions to state that ratios up to 1 per 1,200 are permitted, consistent with the recently approved Rosslyn Plaza PDSP. The Rosslyn Sector Plan did not recommend modifying parking ratios in the Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance has and will continue to allow modifications to the parking ratio based on a transportation demand management plan. It is not appropriate to change the ratios in the Ordinance based on the approval of one project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>PC Member, email, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Under the section titled &quot;Provisions for Additional Density and Height&quot;, the text in line 80 should be amended by inserting &quot;density&quot; after &quot;The County Board may approve&quot; to make it similar to the section A(1)(a). Correction made in revised text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>PC Member, email, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Given how the Building Height section (lines 88-107) is written, would it be right to assume that because it is joined with an &quot;and,&quot; that if one of those items were not met, then the applicant would be ineligible for additional height beyond that shown in the Sector Plan heights map? Also, how are we measuring each of these components? Yes, all findings would be considered by the County Board. The findings are based on the Plan’s goals and do not include a measurement. The County Board would determine whether a project meets the findings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>PC Member, email, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Why aren’t there caps for additional height? How do you achieve the Peaks and Valleys approach without caps? A maximum height for the district is proposed at 470 feet above sea level. The policies of the peaks and valley approach embedded in the Plan and reinforced in the height findings will provide effective guidance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>PC Member, email, 4/12/16</td>
<td>How do we ensure the proper transition to lower density areas? What is considered a proper transition in scale to lower density areas? The Plan provides recommendations for achieving neighborhood transitions and step-backs on the building heights map (page 169) and street and neighborhood transitions guidelines (page 176). This is further reinforced in the proposed height findings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>PC Member, email, 4/12/16</td>
<td>Why are we removing retail from the ordinance? Why not reference the Sector Plan or the Retail Action Plan? What is gained by removing any reference to retail? We want to be creating a vibrant RCRD for people to live, work, and play, and I don’t think that removing retail helps that goal. The ground floor use and streetscape recommendations in the Plan are intended to guide the development of streetscapes and ground floor retail and other uses, and staff proposes that they do not need to be further articulated in the Zoning Ordinance. Further, it may be confusing for the Zoning Ordinance to include site development standards related to only some of the Plan’s policies (retail; streetscape) and not others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Source/Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>How is not allowing height for transformational infrastructure consistent with the County Board’s resolution for flexibility?</td>
<td>The proposed amendment is consistent with the Plan, which recommends that density for transformational infrastructure only be granted when a project is consistent with the building height and form guidelines. The impetus for the recommendation in the Plan emerged from the desire to physically achieve 18th Street North on certain challenged redevelopment sites that could accommodate additional density within the Plan’s recommended heights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Has staff modeled how sites would redevelop on codifying a map vs. not codifying it?</td>
<td>Staff has not conducted modeling beyond what was done for the Rosslyn Sector Plan. From staff’s perspective, there should not be a major difference in building heights resulting from including a map directly in the Zoning Ordinance (with ability to modify the heights on the map, consistent with direction from the County Board resolution) or referencing a map located in the plan and allowing variations in those heights to be considered. Further, it would not be appropriate to make assumptions about what height variations the County Board may approve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Codifying heights does not constrain creative solutions. Why not just codify creative alternative solutions rather than codify heights?</td>
<td>By including findings, the proposed amendment is consistent with the County Board resolution language regarding allowing for creative solutions that meet the vision, goals, and recommendations of the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>How do peaks and valleys get preserved if we allow height flexibility?</td>
<td>See response to Comment #39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>“If warranted” is a very broad term (line 116). Suggest removing lines 113-122 (height above the map).</td>
<td>The term “if warranted” has been removed. In the proposed text, in order to allow a site plan to exceed height on the map, the County Board must review the findings again, and ensure that the proposal with the additional height still meets the findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Prefer the prior version language of “equally or better” to the revised draft (lines 113-122); Projects which exceed the height map should “better meet the findings.”</td>
<td>See response to Comment #35. The Plan provides extensive building height and form guidelines that would be used to evaluate the development proposals. Further, the height findings in the proposed text reinforce the goal of varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Site specific “considerations” should be “challenges” and the applicant should be required explain the challenges (line 116).</td>
<td>Use of the term considerations is consistent with the County Board resolution to afford creative solutions (even if they are not the result of a site-specific challenge).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Heights above the map should not be allowed in order to accommodate TDRs.</td>
<td>Precluding modification of height for TDRs would not be consistent with the language in the Plan that states that single-tower sites may be able to achieve additional height even if 10.0 FAR is exceeded through use of TDRs (page 168).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Concerned that limiting provision of additional density above 10.0 FAR to 18th Street and a second metro station may preclude a future transformational project that hasn’t yet been envisioned.</td>
<td>See response to comments #44 and #45. The impetus for the recommendation in the Plan emerged from the desire to physically achieve 18th Street North on certain challenged redevelopment sites. It was not intended as a mechanism for achieving additional contributions or off-site improvements. Therefore, staff does not recommend broadly expanding the provision as suggested. However, staff concurs that that a second Metro station that would substantially increase Metrorail capacity is a similar transformational infrastructure project that may need particular sites to redevelop in order to be achieved, and therefore the revised draft expands the transformational infrastructure provision to also include substantial expansion of Metrorail capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Support limiting the definition of transformational infrastructure to mitigate a hardship on site.</td>
<td>See response to comments #44 and #45. The impetus for the recommendation in the Plan emerged from the desire to physically achieve 18th Street North on certain challenged redevelopment sites. It was not intended as a mechanism for achieving additional contributions or off-site improvements. Therefore, staff does not recommend broadly expanding the provision as suggested. However, staff concurs that that a second Metro station that would substantially increase Metrorail capacity is a similar transformational infrastructure project that may need particular sites to redevelop in order to be achieved, and therefore the revised draft expands the transformational infrastructure provision to also include substantial expansion of Metrorail capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Rosslyn BID, memo, 6/9/16</td>
<td>To allow for new opportunities and needs, expand the range of transformative infrastructure entitled to density above 10 FAR beyond the new segment of 18th Street and the new metro station.</td>
<td>In addition, the structure of the C-O Rosslyn district requires a site plan to earn density between 3.8/4.8 FAR and 10.0 FAR. It is expected that this mechanism will be used to achieve many of the Plan’s transformative elements (on-site or through contributions) as outlined on page 194 of the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Consider including the term “peaks and valleys” in the building height findings.</td>
<td>This language has been added to the building height findings (7.15.4.B.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Even if the building heights map is not in the ZO, can it be called out in order to give it more emphasis?</td>
<td>Yes, the map is referenced in the provisions for additional building height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>The Building Height findings do not specifically address the goal of providing views to all buildings.</td>
<td>This issue was discussed throughout the ZOCO process. Staff does not recommend including language regarding private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>78.</strong></td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Finding G (sensitive to impact on adjacent buildings) is very vague and could lead to varied interpretations.</td>
<td>views. Though the goal is not called out specifically, this could be considered in making a finding of general consistency with the peaks and valleys policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>79.</strong></td>
<td>Rosslyn BID, memo, 6/9/16</td>
<td>Remove the finding B. 1. (g) “The development project is sensitive to the impact on adjacent buildings.” These criteria are ambiguous and should be covered in the planning document with design guidance that is reflective of the principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>80.</strong></td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Taking language directly from the plan would strengthen the findings.</td>
<td>Staff has further refined the findings to reflect the Plan’s policies, goals, and recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>81.</strong></td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>The findings should be more specific.</td>
<td>Staff does not recommend incorporating objective criteria in the findings. The purpose of the findings is to emphasize the Plan’s policies, goals and recommendations and permit the County Board discretion to determine whether a project meets the findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>82.</strong></td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Revisions to finding E (daylight for open spaces) are weaker than the previously version; “sensitive” is a vague term.</td>
<td>See response to comment #57. Staff has further evaluated the findings to ensure they are consistent with the Plan goals related to height and can be effectively used to evaluate projects. The sunlight finding has been edited to state that the design of the development projects should consider opportunities for daylight for parks and open spaces envisioned in the Rosslyn Sector Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>83.</strong></td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Concerned with how we rank and prioritize these amorphous findings. How do we ensure they are interpreted the same over time?</td>
<td>The findings are not intended to be prioritized. They are intended to emphasize the Plan, which provides detailed guidance. The County Board will determine if the findings are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>84.</strong></td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Review language in line 23 [purpose] and line 101 [height findings] about view corridors. They should be consistent.</td>
<td>This language has been reviewed. The purpose, line 23, was revised to use the term “preserves,” consistent with the findings (line 94).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>85.</strong></td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Is there any guidance in the Plan about using amenities at the level of the mechanical penthouse? Would this warrant a change to the existing provision in C-O Rosslyn that states mechanical penthouse area in excess of that used for elevator, mechanical, or maintenance equipment shall be counted as gross floor area.</td>
<td>The Plan recommends creative design of the penthouse and use of rooftops. It does not recommend any changes to the way in which density is calculated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>86.</strong></td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>How is public open space achieved without a specific Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td>See response to Comment #47. Landscaped open space is not defined in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Consider building off the current landscaped open space requirement to achieve public open space or contributions?</td>
<td>The Zoning Ordinance, is not required to be public, and is not utilized to negotiate off-site park improvements. The Plan provides guidance for considering park and open space improvements as part of a project’s community benefits. The Plan recommends that community benefit contributions be strategically focused to accomplish elements of the Plan more effectively. This approach would allow the County Board to make decisions about how to best focus community benefits during the site plan process, based on a site’s location and corresponding on-site or adjacent improvements, County priorities at the time of approval, and timing of infrastructure or park improvements. Requiring an open space contribution as part of the Zoning Ordinance is not consistent with the Plan guidance and would remove the ability to make strategic decisions at the time of site plan approval. Staff continues to recommend removing the landscaped open space requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>There is a lot of concern about public open space in the Radnor/Fort Myer Heights Civic Association.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Park and Recreation Commission, 6/28/16</td>
<td>Concerned that public open space goals may not be achieved. Maintain the landscaped open space requirement or consider changing it to require public open space (on-site or through a contribution).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. ZOCO, 5/25/16</td>
<td>Minimum soil volumes should be incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance.</td>
<td>Soil volumes are better established through the site plan and/or landscape plan process based on policies and standards in place at the time. Staff does not recommend codifying a requirement for soil volume.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. ZOCO, 5/25/16 (member of the general public in attendance)</td>
<td>The Zoning Ordinance should consider prior approvals that already meet or exceed the building heights map (e.g., Rosslyn Plaza PDSP approval for heights up to 275 feet in area recommended for 270 feet in the Plan).</td>
<td>See response above. The Rosslyn Plaza PDSP, approved by the County Board in March 2016, approved a height of no greater than 275 feet for a portion of the site that was recommended at 270 feet on the Building Heights Map. The proposed text would permit the County Board, at the time of final site plan, to approve a site plan that exceeds the Building Heights Map. The County Board would need to find that the site plan is consistent with the Rosslyn Sector Plan, including the findings that reinforce the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Date/Source</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16 (member of the general public in attendance)</td>
<td>It’s unclear what the finding about ground level view corridors (line 111) refers to; are these defined in the Plan?</td>
<td>Ground level view corridors were explicitly specified in the Rosslyn Plan Framework, which informed many of the vision and many of the design recommendations of the Plan. However, the Plan does not include specific guidance for ground level view corridor locations. Therefore, the language regarding ground level view corridors has been removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>ZOCO, 5/25/16 (member of the general public in attendance)</td>
<td>While the peaks and valleys approach considered the benefits to private views that may be achieved by varied heights, I do not think the goal was to protect private views. This should not be one of the building height findings.</td>
<td>Staff concurs. Protecting views from private buildings is not included in the proposed findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Rosslyn BID, memo, 6/9/16</td>
<td>Continue to reference the design guidance in the Sector Plan document per the resolution as adopted by the County Board on July 23, 2015: “This plan is not a regulatory document but rather a guiding plan for the future of the RCRD...”. Staff’s efforts to implement this directive and maintain a level of flexibility in the C-O Rosslyn language are commendable. Codified language must reflect the resolution’s flexible intent: “in the spirit of affording creativity, projects that do not adhere to the letter of every provision in the design guidelines shall be reviewed to determine whether they demonstrate a clear alternative approach that achieves the stated intent of the design guidelines and goals of the plan and, in the Board’s judgment warrant consideration”. Regulatory language is absolute and does not allow for creative urban design to embrace the future and serve the community at large.</td>
<td>No changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>Rosslyn BID, memo, 6/9/16</td>
<td>Continue to allow planning staff and County Board discretion to appropriately consider each site plan in its context and against the sector plan guidance, at the time of the site plan process and approval.</td>
<td>Staff concurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Source/Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>ZOCO, 7/12/16</td>
<td>Keep finding about sensitivity to adjacent buildings, but make it less vague. Add a finding about preserving views from other buildings – findings include public, but not private views.</td>
<td>This issue was discussed throughout the ZOCO process. While the Sector Plan promotes good views from buildings, staff does not agree with stating that private views should be preserved in the findings. The proposed height provisions state “including but not limited to” with respect to all the findings; this will ensure that this and other goals and design guidelines can still be addressed where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Resident, email, 7/13/16</td>
<td>For the struck building height finding (e) I recommend replacing it with more precise language similar to: &quot;The project complements adjacent buildings by providing varied facades and massing and promotes good views from, and daylight access to adjacent buildings.&quot; (this uses language from policy B1b and B2).</td>
<td>Staff agrees and has revised the proposed text from “maximizes” to “considers.” This is consistent with the language used in the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>ZOCO, 7/12/16</td>
<td>Changing “sensitivity to daylight” to “maximize opportunities” for daylight seems like a very high bar that only a one story building could meet. Consider instead “recognizing other goals” or “preserves or protects”</td>
<td>Staff agrees and has revised the proposed text from “maximizes” to “considers.” This is consistent with the language used in the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Land use attorney, email 7/11/16</td>
<td>The revisions to lines 103-104 (Section 7.15.4.B.1.d), specifically the word “maximizes,” is problematic. The prior language expressly recognized that increased height should be sensitive to daylight impacts. The newly proposed language is much broader in scope because it focuses on the entire “design of the development project,” rather than just the increased height. In addition, the word “maximizes” could be interpreted to mean that any design feature that results in even the slightest decrease in daylight, whether related to building height or not, would preclude the County Board’s approval of additional height. We therefore request that the prior language be restored to read as follows: “The increase in building height is sensitive to the impact on daylight for public parks and open spaces envisioned in the Rosslyn Sector Plan.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>ZOCO, 7/12/16</td>
<td>Rosslyn Implementation Comment-Response Matrix, updated 9/26/16</td>
<td>Regarding transformational infrastructure for Metro, make sure it is clear that density may only be earned for a major infrastructure change that changes capacity for the system; not simply a new entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>ZOCO, 7/12/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggest that the text use “conform to the plan” instead of “consistent with the plan” throughout the proposed zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Resident, email, 7/13/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>The language in section 7.15.4 B. should use &quot;conform to&quot; rather than &quot;consistent with.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>ZOCO, 7/12/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grave concerns about ability to permit density above 10.0 FAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>ZOCO, 7/12/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 99-100 (b) - suggest using “distinctive skyline, as recommended by the plan.” Another member indicated that the plan uses “distinctive and dynamic”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>ZOCO, 7/12/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Why list any findings at all if the general principal is that this list is not inclusive? The list seems like a prioritization of elements in the plan that define height, but we are not prioritizing anything else, such as community benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>ZOCO, 7/12/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider adding a list of “site specific considerations” in line 112.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>ZOCO/7/12/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider revising finding (c) which addresses transitions in scale and height to lower density neighborhoods, to also include “and open space”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>ZOCO, 7/12/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Park and Recreation Commission (PRC) is concerned that park and open space elements will not be executed as they are laid out in the sector plan, but they do not know how this might be resolved if, as staff has indicated, open space cannot be prioritized in the Ordinance. However, there is recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. ZOCO, 7/12/16</td>
<td>RAFOM has concerns about removing the 20% landscaped open space requirement</td>
<td>that 20% requirement does not address this issue.</td>
<td>community benefits. The Plan recommends that community benefit contributions be strategically focused to accomplish elements of the Plan more effectively. This approach would allow the County Board to make decisions about how to best focus community benefits during the site plan process, based on a site’s location and corresponding on-site or adjacent improvements, County priorities at the time of approval, and timing of infrastructure or park improvements. Requiring an open space contribution as part of the Zoning Ordinance is not consistent with the Plan guidance and would remove the ability to make strategic decisions at the time of site plan approval. Staff continues to recommend removing the landscaped open space requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. ZOCO, 7/12/16</td>
<td>Do not support specific zoning language that allows for modification of height above the Building Heights Map. Heights recommended in the Rosslyn to Courthouse Urban Design Study were not adopted into the zoning ordinance, but the zoning for that area does not point to ways in which height may be exceeded.</td>
<td>Staff recommends that the zoning be explicit regarding the County Board’s ability to permit heights above those shown on the Building Heights Map due to site specific considerations, rather than suggesting the County Board use the general site plan modifications in §15.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. Land use attorney, email 7/11/16</td>
<td>To ensure that the proposed changes to the ZO do not preclude approval of a final site plan for Phase 1 of Rosslyn Plaza at 275’, the text should explicitly reference prior site plan approvals (which would also cover PDSPs since they are a form of site plan). Specifically, lines 60-63 should be amended as follows: “In considering the approval of a site plan the County Board may approve additional density and height above that provided in §7.15.3.B where it finds that the development project is consistent with the Rosslyn Sector Plan or related site plan approved subsequent to the adoption thereof ....”</td>
<td>Staff recommends that the zoning be explicit regarding the County Board’s ability to permit heights above those shown on the Building Heights Map due to site specific considerations, rather than suggesting the County Board use the general site plan modifications in §15.5. See response above. The Rosslyn Plaza PDSP, approved by the County Board in March 2016, approved a height of no greater than 275 feet for a portion of the site that was recommended at 270 feet on the Building Heights Map. The proposed text would permit the County Board, at the time of final site plan, to approve a site plan that exceeds the Building Heights Map. The County Board would need to find that the final site plan is consistent with the PDSP approval and the Rosslyn Sector Plan, including the findings that reinforce the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. Land use attorney, email 7/11/16</td>
<td>The change to line 90 (Section 7.15.4.B) eliminates the Board’s ability to increase building heights above the building heights map, as contemplated by 7.15.4.B.2. By renumbering the subparts, the first paragraph now also applies to 7.15.4.B.2, stating that the Board may approve additional height only “up to the</td>
<td>This was an error in the formatting of the text for ZOCO. No renumbering was intended. The formatting has been corrected and was shown at the July 12, 2016, ZOCO meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>Land use attorney, email 7/11/16</td>
<td>Further, the revised text in lines 109-110 (Section 7.15.4.B.2) would also suggest that no height above the building heights map could be approved. “Variations” in heights is less clear than the previous language, which referred to “height above that shown on the building heights map.” Moreover, “variations” in height could be interpreted to only refer to changes in heights to buildings relative to one another (peaks and valleys) from that shown on the map, rather than increases above the maximums shown on the map. For these reasons, we suggest the following for lines 109-112: “The County Board may approve height above that shown on the building heights map in the Rosslyn Sector Plan, as well as variations from step-backs and neighborhood height transitions shown thereon, based on site specific ....”</td>
<td>Variations is intended to mean heights that are inconsistent with the Building Heights Map. Staff does not recommend a change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>Land use attorney, email 7/11/16</td>
<td>The language in lines 76-79 should be further broadened to allow for other transformational infrastructure such as the proposed pedestrian/bicycle bridge from Rosslyn Plaza over I-66 to Roosevelt Island bridge. The current language only refers to 18th Street and Metro-related items. We therefore propose the following language: “…physically accommodate a new segment(s) of 18th Street N.; infrastructure that substantially increases capacity of the Metrorail system...; or infrastructure that substantially increases pedestrian and/or bicycle access to the Potomac River....”</td>
<td>The impetus for the recommendation in the Plan emerged from the desire to physically achieve 18th Street North on certain challenged redevelopment sites. It was not intended as a mechanism for achieving additional contributions or off-site improvements and expanding the ability to modify density may have unintended consequences that work counter to the goals and intentions of the design guidelines set forth in the Plan. Therefore, staff does not recommend broadly expanding the provision as suggested. However, staff concurs that a second Metro station that would substantially increase Metrorail capacity is a similar transformational infrastructure project that may need particular sites to redevelop in order to be achieved, and therefore the revised draft expands the transformational infrastructure provision to also include substantial expansion of Metrorail capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>Rosslyn BID, memo, 8/18/16</td>
<td>RBIC continues to support expanding the range of transformative infrastructure entitled to density above 10 FAR beyond the new segment of 18th Street and the new metro station. The additional flexibility would benefit the community by providing a ready mechanism to allow emerging critical infrastructure needs and to create the environment where unforeseen infrastructure opportunities can be accommodated.</td>
<td>In addition, the structure of the C-O Rosslyn district requires a site plan to earn permissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>can be proposed and acted upon in a commercially reasonable time.</td>
<td>density between 3.8/4.8 FAR and 10.0 FAR. It is expected that this mechanism will be used to achieve many of the Plan’s transformative elements (on-site or through contributions) as outlined on page 194 of the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>PC member, email, 7/13/16</td>
<td>In order to keep track of approvals and understand whether the peaks and valleys policy has been followed, staff should keep a “tracking map” publically available that includes all approved heights that vary from the Building Heights Map in the Plan. Further, developers should be required as part of site plan review to provide a digital copy of their building in its context (approved/built/planned heights of adjacent buildings). This will give the public a chance to ask staff to show in detail whether the policy model, site plan by site plan, is being observed.</td>
<td>Staff agrees that a map with approved heights should be provided at the time of SPRC review. Further, as part of the 4.1 site plan process, applicants would be expected to provide exhibits, such as views of the proposed site plan within the context of surrounding buildings, in order to demonstrate consistency the vision, goals, and recommendations of the Rosslyn Sector Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>Resident, email, 7/13/16</td>
<td>The six vision principles in the Sector Plan stated that “Rosslyn will be an urban district that celebrates nature and recreation through its diverse network of public parks, open spaces, and tree-lined streets.” I recommend that one of the goals in the zoning code mirror that vision principle.</td>
<td>Staff concurs. The goals of the district in §7.15.1 were updated to incorporate language regarding a diverse network of public parks, open spaces, and tree-lined streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>Rosslyn BID, memo, 8/18/16</td>
<td>RBIC supports language in 7.15.4 B1 that relies on and reflects the Sector Plan’s adopted design guidance and policy, and which does not codify the heights map. The language should allow final height and design of each development to be considered individually through the 4.1 site plan process, which provides extensive opportunities for community input, analysis by the County’s professional staff and permits the flexibility to County Board to act based on that input and analysis with the guidance of the Sector Plan. The findings proposed by staff in the zoning language restrict development to the vision and guidance of the Sector Plan and respond to the flexibility required in the County Board’s resolution.</td>
<td>Staff concurs. No changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Source/Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Rosslyn BID, memo, 8/18/16</td>
<td>RBIC supports staff’s recommended removal of the language regarding required open space. The 4.1 site plan review process already permits the opportunity for a thoughtful consideration of open space needs, which includes community input to devise practical, usable and effective solutions. Forcing a mandate and arbitrary standard on properties with varied conditions has left the community with numerous examples of wasted opportunities and public space in difficult or awkward locations.</td>
<td>Staff concurs. No changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>PC member, email, 9/3/16</td>
<td>There is a concern that the effect of increased building heights could degrade some solar access to the pedestrian realm. Use language from the plan to modify proposed finding e) to: The development project provides an appealing, pedestrian-scaled street environment, with balanced sun/shade opportunities.</td>
<td>As proposed, the County Board, when granting additional height and density, must find a site plan consistent with the Rosslyn Sector Plan. Further, the proposed provisions for additional building height state that the Board must find a project consistent with the peaks and valleys building heights policy, which includes a goal of balanced sun/shade opportunities. Therefore, staff does not believe a specific finding of balanced sun/shade opportunities is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Planning Commission, letter, 9/7/16</td>
<td>While the Commission did not discuss a preference for either including or not including a building heights map in the C-O Rosslyn district, Commission members expressed concern that the Request to Advertise should not foreclose discussion by only advertising one option.</td>
<td>Public discussion of various approaches to implementing the Rosslyn Sector Plan’s building height recommendations have taken place over the course of four meetings with participation from ZOCO (a Planning Commission Committee of the Whole) and members of the Rosslyn Process Panel. As described in the RTA staff report, the zoning approach proposed for advertisement would best implement the Sector Plan’s peaks and valleys policy, based on the considerations discussed with ZOCO and the County Board’s resolution adopted with the Sector Plan. Further, advertising an option that does not include the building heights map should not foreclose discussion because the County Board could choose to re-advertise the proposed amendment if warranted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>Rosslyn BID, letter, 9/21/2016</td>
<td>While none of the stakeholders or participants achieved all of their objectives, the resulting amendments proposed by staff meet the core intent of the Rosslyn Sector Plan and the accompanying Board resolution. The BID supports the proposed amendments in their entirety and requests that the scope of the RTA be limited to the staff proposal.</td>
<td>No changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>Property owner, letter, 9/21/2016</td>
<td>The proposed zoning amendment is too restrictive in some instances, but overall it is an acceptable compromise that was developed through input from multiple stakeholders.</td>
<td>No changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>National Park Service, letter, 9/22/2016</td>
<td>The zoning amendment should incorporate language to protect viewsheds and cultural landscapes for NPS resources within the National Capital Region. Views of and from national parks should be identified as priority public view corridors.</td>
<td>The Rosslyn Sector Plan identifies several viewsheds from the public observation deck to NPS properties that should be preserved, and it recommends a dynamic and distinctive skyline for Rosslyn. These Plan goals are reinforced through the findings in the proposed zoning amendment. However, the proposal to identify viewsheds into Rosslyn from various points within the region that must be preserved was not part of the community discussions that led to the adopted Sector Plan and would be a new policy for Rosslyn. The purpose of the proposed zoning amendment is to implement the policies in the Sector Plan, not to consider new policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>RTA Public Hearing, 9/24/2016</td>
<td>The County should perform a cost-benefit analysis before approving site plan applications.</td>
<td>Site plan applications are reviewed by the County for compliance with adopted plans, policies, and ordinances. This comment is outside the scope of the Rosslyn Sector Plan Implementation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>RTA Public Hearing, 9/24/2016</td>
<td>Support for advertising C-O Rosslyn amendment with a building heights map (2 speakers)</td>
<td>See response #121 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>RTA Public Hearing, 9/24/2016</td>
<td>The proposed amendment should not allow the County Board to approve both building height above the Sector Plan map and density above 10.0 FAR through Transfer of Development Rights (TDR).</td>
<td>The proposed amendment does limit the County Board’s ability to approve both building height above the map and density above 10.0 FAR for transformational infrastructure. The Sector Plan recommendations for building height flexibility for single-tower sites planned for heights below 300 feet (p. 168) suggests that in such cases, a building on a single-tower site could exceed both the height map and 10.0 FAR if TDR is utilized. Therefore, limiting the County Board’s ability to approve both additional height and density above 10.0 through TDR would not be consistent with this provision in the Sector Plan. Development proposals that seek to use this provision would be reviewed with all of the guidance for single-tower sites and other Sector Plan guidance for building height and urban form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>RTA Public Hearing, 9/24/2016</td>
<td>Support allowing density above 10.0 FAR for new segments of 18th Street, but language allowing additional density for Metro system capacity infrastructure is too vague.</td>
<td>Staff believes the proposed language regarding Metro improvements is clear, but is open to suggestions on revising this language between advertisement and adoption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>